

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXII No. 1 JULY 1949

FROM WITCHCRAFT TO SPIRITUALISM

I. THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION

“FOR what quiet rest could the souls of the elect enjoy or possess in Abraham’s bosom if they were to be plucked from thence at a witch’s call and commandment?” So wrote the sixteenth-century rationalist Reginald Scot, in his *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, a work doubtless used by Shakespeare when writing *Macbeth*. Neither does Scot approve the opinion of “Tertullian, Augustine and Kimchi” that the devil appeared to Saul, whose imagination he thinks was deceived by “a mere cosenage”. To espouse such a view when belief in witchcraft was endemic was not to make oneself popular, but the author countered unpleasant possibilities by an edifying comparison between papists and witches. Scot died shortly before the accession of James I, who in the “advertisement” to his *Daemonologie* calls the sceptic’s opinions “damnable”. Though critically minded in individual cases where witchcraft was thought to be at work, the King was a wholehearted believer in the thing itself, including the existence of *incubi*, which he thought were common in Lapland, Finland, Orkney and Shetland. To the question why papists were such efficient exorcists he could only reply that as error in their religion did not invalidate their baptism, neither did it render less efficacious their exorcisms. He held, however, that many popish exorcisms were counterfeit and for the purpose of confirming a “rotten religion”.

Throughout the seventeenth century the controversy between believers in witchcraft and sceptics continued to rage, though Lecky asserts that acceptance of its reality was practically extinct among the educated classes at the time of the Revolution. The most notable of the attempts to stem the tide of rationalism was made in the *Sadducismus Triumphatus* of Joseph Glanvil, a royal chaplain. Glanvil, who denounced Scot’s book as “a farrago”, belonged to a circle interested in occultism which met at Lady Conway’s house at Ragley in Warwickshire.

This set, of which there is some account in *John Inglesant*, included the Cambridge platonist Henry More and the Rosicrucian van Helmont, a link between alchemy and modern science. Glanvil's book is chiefly remembered for its description of alleged supernormal phenomena at the house of a Wiltshire magistrate named Mompesson shortly after the Restoration. Mompesson had confiscated the drum of a vagrant drummer named William Drury and from the moment the drum was brought to his home a ghostly drumming was heard. When a clergyman was praying with the family the ghost withdrew into the cockloft "but returned so soon as the praying was done". On Guy Fawkes's day "it left a sulphurous smell behind it". There was a mysterious singing in the chimney (reminding us of the Saragossa poltergeist of 1934) and a bible rose into the air by itself and was deposited on ashes, lying open at Mark iii, face downwards.¹ Glanvil visited the house and heard the ghost "pant like a dog out of health". Although Wiltshire was more remote from London than it is today the nature of the phenomena was keenly debated in the metropolis. The sceptics were anxious to explain everything away and were satisfied that this had been done when the gentlemen whom the King sent to investigate the matter neither saw nor heard anything. Pepys discussed the matter with Lord Sandwich and they agreed to remain doubters, since, though the ghost could play any tune played to him on another drum, "yet one time he tried to play [by himself] and could not", a limitation hardly to be expected in the devil. Modern rationalists have agreed with contemporary sceptics in ascribing the whole thing to trickery on the part of Drury. But it is difficult to understand Drury's motive in exposing himself to the serious risk of being burnt alive for witchcraft merely for the satisfaction of playing a practical joke. Nor is it easy to see why, if everything is to be explained by imposture on the part of an uneducated man, it could no have been easily exposed. It is, however, unlikely that the exploits of the drummer grew less marvellous in the telling. Drury was, in fact, acquitted of the charge of witchcraft, but was sentenced to transportation as a vagrant.

Those who were anxious to discredit the supernatural now

¹ *Quomodo potest satanas satanam ejicere?*, iii, 23.

spread the story that Mompesson himself had discovered the whole thing to be a trick. But the fact seems to be that the magistrate knew of this story and yet did not correct it. As Mompesson's son said to John Wesley's eldest brother, Samuel, "the resort of gentlemen to my father's house was so great that he could not bear the expense. He therefore took no pains to correct the story that he had found out the cheat; although he and I and all the family knew the account which was published to be punctually true."¹ The "Drummer of Tedworth", who inspired a play by Addison, has a permanent interest for the student of English religious thought by his illustration of the existence of something new in the life of the nation, a dread of admitting the reality of the supernatural, a dread which had a beneficial by-product. For it saved from a cruel death many old women, unlucky enough to incur in the eyes of their neighbours the suspicion of being witches.

A sign of the new spirit was that before long judges sought to procure the acquittals of persons prosecuted on this charge. The last case of a sentence of death in England for witchcraft seems to have been that of Jane Wenham, a Hertfordshire wise-woman, in the reign of Queen Anne. Whether as a direct result of it or not, a recrudescence of the fear of witches occurred at the time of the Sacheverell trial and Jane Wenham was prosecuted for bewitching a girl. The judge, Sir John Powell, did his best to obtain the defendant's acquittal. When she was charged with being able to fly he said "there is no law against flying". The jury was very angry. Jane was convicted and, the law being what it was, the judge had no alternative but to condemn her to death. Powell was, however, able to obtain a royal pardon. The clergy seem to have been less sceptical where witchcraft was concerned than the educated laity. Wesley's father preached against consulting "cunning men", and Emily Wesley thought that the famous ghost or poltergeist, as it would now be called, which disturbed the rectory at Epworth was animated by spite against her parent. North of the Tweed belief in witches continued to produce grim results, and in Sutherland an old woman, suspected of being a witch, was burnt in 1727. So little did the poor creature understand what was happening that she wished,

¹ Wesley's *Journal*, 25 May, 1768.

says Sir Walter Scott, to warm her wrinkled hands at the fire which was to consume her.

But these savage penalties, for a crime in the possibility of which so many had already come to disbelieve, were out of harmony with the spirit of the age. Partly no doubt as the result of genuine humanitarian feeling, but mainly perhaps in consequence of the spread of deism, English jurisprudence soon ceased to take cognizance of witchcraft. On 2 February, 1735/6, there was read in the House of Commons for the second time a Bill to repeal the Statute of the First Year of King James I entitled "an Act against Conjuration, Witchcraft and dealing with evil and wicked spirits", and the Act "Anentis Witchcrafts" of the ninth year of Queen Mary of Scotland. During its passage through the Upper House an amendment, accepted by the Commons, was inserted for the protection of "ignorant persons". This amendment exposed to penalties "those pretending to exercise Witchcraft, Sorcery, Conjuration or Enchantment or undertaking to tell fortunes or pretending to find lost objects". No reports of the debates on the Bill appear to exist, but the *Journal of the House of Lords* indicates that seven bishops were present when it passed its third reading on 3 March. The Bill received the royal assent on 24 March and came into force three months later, though an Irish Act against witchcraft remained on the Statute Book till the early part of the last century.

John Wesley wrote in his *Journal* thirty years after the passage of the Act that giving up belief in witchcraft was in effect giving up belief in the Bible. Whether the Witchcraft Act be regarded as a triumph of infidelity or as one of the glories of the early-Hanoverian period it must be conceded that it removed unpleasant possibilities of intimidation and blackmail. With the revolution in ideas even its existence became forgotten and many were those who heard of it for the first time when it was invoked in the "Witchcraft Trial" of 1944.

As prejudice against Catholics was not killed by Emancipation, neither was the deeply rooted fear of witchcraft among the masses obliterated by the Act of 1736. Debarred from the possibility of bringing to trial old women suspected of being witches, popular fury against them vented itself in other ways. More

than one instance is on record during the eighteenth century of recourse being had to the water ordeal, known as "swimming", in the case of persons suspected of witchcraft. By this grossly unfair procedure the suspected person, generally a woman, was thrown into the water with a rope tied round the waist. If she floated it was taken as proof of guilt; if the victim sank there was danger of her being choked by mud before being pulled out. A shocking instance of this occurred in 1751, when an elderly couple, suspected of having bewitched a publican, were "swum" near Tring in Hertfordshire. The woman, on being seen to float, was brutally thrust under water with a pitchfork and when taken out was found to be dead. It is true that the miscreant responsible for this was hanged, but although the local magistrates must have been aware that the ordeal was going to take place they seem to have been too frightened to stop it.¹ Even in the last century there were persons who lost their lives under suspicion of being witches. In 1863 a man died from the effects of being "swum" at Sible Hedingham in Essex,² and twelve years later a Warwickshire woman named Ann Turner was killed with a hayfork, whether intentionally or not, by a young man who believed himself to have been bewitched by her.³

In truth, belief in witchcraft is not yet dead in England, and cases of persons who suppose themselves to have been overlooked by a witch have occurred within recent years. Fortune-telling thrives, and according to Montagu Summers a "black mass" was enacted in the ruins of Godstow Nunnery at Oxford as recently as 1932.

The decline of belief in witchcraft and its concomitant savagery is generally attributed to the spread of education, and no doubt the two were not unconnected. Less often is it recognized that the appearance of rival forms of occultism has helped to diminish the popularity of the witch-cult. Neither atheism nor deism will ever satisfy the majority of mankind, and the deists who voted for the Witchcraft Bill were, as has been seen, far from imposing their views on the majority of the nation. How little deism served to extinguish belief in the supernatural, not merely among rustics but among Londoners as well, is shown

¹ C. Hole, *Witchcraft in England*, p. 148.

² *Ibid.*, 150.

³ *Ibid.*, 156.

by the extraordinary story of the "Cock Lane ghost", whose rappings threw London into a commotion in the polite age of Johnson and Horace Walpole. When the raps were first heard in 1760 they were thought to be made by a cobbler in an adjoining house, but after they took place on a Sunday night when the cobbler did not work this explanation had to be given up. In 1761 there was a cessation of the rappings for a considerable period, but when they were resumed they claimed to emanate from the spirit of a woman who asserted that she had been poisoned by arsenic in a pint of spiced beer, though medical evidence attested that her death had been due to smallpox. The noises were clearly associated in some way with a young girl, Elizabeth Parsons, whose father was parish clerk at St John's, Clerkenwell; and Walpole, who said that "the whole town of London" thought of nothing else, attributed the "imposture" to a drunken parish clerk anxious to revenge himself on a man who owed him money by implicating his debtor in suspicion of murder. He further thought it high time that the Archbishop of Canterbury caused the rappings to cease; but added that the Methodists had adopted the ghost. In a letter to Horace Mann, Walpole describes his own visit to the haunted house. He went there one evening after the opera with a distinguished company which included the Duke of York. Fifty persons had squeezed themselves into a small room in order to hear the noises. But on recognizing the King's brother they drew respectfully aside, thus enabling the party to enter. Walpole heard noises but saw nothing; which led him to comment that the ghost should be described as an "audition" rather than an "apparition". But the climax of the whole affair came when Dr Johnson visited the scene to interrogate the *soi-disant* spirit. For the purpose of examination the girl was transferred to the residence of the incumbent of St John's, Clerkenwell. Thither the sage repaired on the night of 1 February, 1762 with several gentlemen "eminent for their rank and character", among whom was the Rev John Douglas, later Bishop of Salisbury, a "great detector of impostures".

Although solemnly adjured to do so several times, the spirit declined to manifest its presence, though the girl said that she felt it like a mouse on her back. The party then adjourned to

St John's Church, where the ghost had promised to rap on the coffin containing the body it had supposedly tenanted. When it failed to keep faith the company assumed the whole thing to have been an imposture. This view has been generally accepted. But it is not altogether satisfying. Granted that most of those who heard the raps were uneducated and uncritical persons, this would not have been the case with all of them, and that a girl of twelve or thirteen, without experience in conjuring and without any motive, should be able to deceive "the whole town" of London is certainly not probable. If it were a case of simple deception how was it that the fraud was not quickly exposed? Elizabeth Parsons was, it is true, no longer in danger of being burnt alive as a witch, but still things could have been made unpleasant for her. An incident which took place shortly after Dr Johnson's pretended exposure supports the view that the spirit manifestation was not a mere imposture. For when the girl was told that, unless she reproduced the raps, her parents would be sent to Newgate she concealed beneath her stays a small board on which the kettle used to stand and made raps on it. But the raps so produced were quite different from the ones she had made formerly. This suggests that the girl was possessed of some unusual psychic gift which was apt to fail her at critical moments or that she was being used as the agent of some discarnate but capricious intelligence.

There is evidence which indicates that Johnson himself was in later years not quite satisfied about the completeness of his "exposure". He had assumed that the disturbances must be attributable either to a hoax or to the ghost of a deceased woman. When the spirit had failed to give satisfactory evidence of its identity, imposture was assumed as a matter of course. But when many years later Boswell spoke to the Doctor about the matter, though not wishing to admit that the opinion to which he had given forcible expression was wrong, Johnson exhibited a strong disinclination to be questioned too deeply, as though an under-current of doubt were troubling him. Elizabeth Parsons subsequently married, and died at Chiswick in 1807. But so far as is known she had no further experiences of what would now be termed a "psychic" character. There is, however, a further circumstance connected with the happenings in Cock

Lane which calls for our attention. That is their similarity to the rappings and scratchings at Hydesville in the State of New York which took place nearly ninety years later. Yet while the manifestations in Cock Lane had no sequel those at Hydesville formed the starting-point of a religious movement which spread throughout the world.

In no age from remote prehistoric times to our own has interest in the occult been languishing. Nor can such interest be treated as something invariably morbid, though the subject is one likely to have a peculiar fascination for persons who are not well balanced. Occultism is a subject from which the majority of healthy-minded persons will instinctively turn away. Yet even to a believer in Christianity it presents questions which may form the subject of rational inquiry. What are the limits to human credulity? What further lessons have we to learn by the study of abnormal psychology? What is the range of activity permitted by God to evil spirits? These are all legitimate questions for us to put to ourselves. Whatever answer we may give to them it is certain that it is in an atmosphere of arid scepticism that men's minds feel an especial attraction for the occult. It is probable that it was by way of registering an unconscious protest against deism that crowds flocked to hear the ghostly noises in Cock Lane. In France the decline of belief in Christianity must be held responsible for the strange careers of such men as Cagliostro and the Comte de Saint-Germain and the interest shown in the prophecies of Cazotte about the coming revolution, episodes well worth taking to heart by those who suppose that men automatically grow more rational when they give up belief in religion.

Both Saint-Germain and Cagliostro should be counted among the anticipators of the Spiritualist movement, whether they be looked on as simple impostors or as men possessed of the capacity to excite genuine spiritualistic manifestations. The former, whose origin and nationality are unknown, appeared at the French Court about 1750, being introduced to Louis XV and Madame de Pompadour by the Marshal de Saxe. Saint-Germain claimed to be the possessor of an elixir of long life and said that he had been alive at the time of the Council of Trent, probably with a view to spreading stories about it of a not too

favourable kind. He professed to be a strict Catholic and observed the Church's fasts punctiliously, but stories of evocations of spirits gathered round him. After about ten years in Paris, Saint-Germain fled to London, where he created a brief sensation. His last years seem to have been spent in Germany, where he did propaganda on behalf of the "illuminized" Freemasonry of "Spartacus" Weishaupt. More famous still was the Sicilian adventurer Joseph Balsamo, who took the name of Cagliostro. He gave himself out as a disciple of Saint-Germain. Laying claim to be the heir to the knowledge of the ancient alchemists, he toured Europe in triumph. Not only did he evoke spirits, but he announced himself as the possessor of the *lapis philosophorum*, of philtres to restore youth and strength, of water to remove sterility in women, in addition to boasting that he could enlarge precious stones and turn mercury into gold. His amazing career certainly raises in the mind the question whether the eighteenth century was not too over-confident in its claim to be considered the age of Enlightenment. Had Cagliostro lived a century later he might perhaps have been the initiator of a new religious cult. But the mentality which had bred the myriad Protestant sects was out of fashion in his day. The craze of the moment was for secret societies,¹ and Cagliostro left behind him not a new religious sect, but a new form of Freemasonry said to be derived from the mysteries of the ancient Egyptians.²

The wizard was imprudent enough to settle in Rome, where he made his headquarters at the Villa Malta on the Pincio. There, on 15 September, 1789, the Abate Benedetti attended a function which seems to have been something between a spiritualist séance and a masonic lodge. Arriving at two o'clock in the morning, and admitted only after close scrutiny, he found a large company, including several ecclesiastics and religious. He was particularly astonished to observe among them no less a person than the French ambassador, Cardinal de Bernis. Cagliostro went into a sort of trance in which he appeared to become

¹ It has been computed that Europe contained no less than fourteen hundred such at this period.

² This rite seems to have become extinct during the Revolution, but early in the last century a form of Freemasonry called the Rite of Misraim (Egypt) was founded by a mason named Lechangeur, who had quarrelled with the Grand Orient.

clairvoyant. On 27 December he was arrested by the police, not only as a formal heretic, but as having rendered himself liable to the penalties against *magiae superstitiosae magistros et sectatores*.¹ The magician was condemned to death, but, as was usual at the time, the sentence was commuted by Pius VI to one of imprisonment for life. Cagliostro died in the prison of the Holy Office and, having been suddenly carried off by apoplexy without having given signs of contrition, was buried in unconsecrated ground.

For the understanding of the antecedents of modern spiritualism there are two men with whose careers it is even more necessary to have some acquaintance than with that of Cagliostro—Emanuel Swedenborg and Franz Anton Mesmer. To the average Englishman the name of Swedenborg is perhaps merely that of the founder of one of the smaller religious sects, a body which he may be tempted to class with the followers of Joanna Southcott, though Swedenborg, perhaps, no more than Wesley, intended to be the founder of a sect. An older contemporary of Linnaeus and a distinguished man of science, as well as a religious philosopher, Emanuel Svedberg² was born in 1688, being the son of a Swedish pastor who later became Lutheran Bishop of Skara. The first psychic abnormality to be observed in him was that, as a boy, a curious suspension of his respiration appeared to take place when he was saying his prayers. On growing up he gave evidence of second sight, of which the most notable instance was the accurate description he gave of a fire, raging in Stockholm, when he was at Gothenburg three hundred miles away.

Swedenborg's visions did not begin till he was fifty-seven. For an account of their origin we depend on his friend, Robsahn, Director of the Bank of Stockholm, who says that he received it from the seer himself. The description appears banal enough unless its cabbalistic significance be grasped.³ Swedenborg was in London and had dined alone. Toward the end of his meal a kind of mist spread before his eyes and he saw the

¹ D. Silvagni, *La corte e la Società Romana nei secoli, XVIII e XIX*, Vol. I, Cap. 15.

² The name Svedberg was changed to Swedenborg in 1718 when the family was ennobled by Queen Ulrica Elenore.

³ The Cabbala was the work of Jewish thinkers imbued with Neoplatonic ideas who reacted against the Aristotelianism of Maimonides. According to it the primordial man was an emanation from the Deity.

floor of the room covered with hideous reptiles. The darkness grew deeper and then passed away. Swedenborg then saw a man sitting in the corner of the room. The man said "Eat not so much." The next night the man appeared again and said that *he was God* and had chosen Swedenborg to unfold the spiritual sense of Holy Scripture. Swedenborg's theological speculations bring him nearer to the ancient Gnostics than to the Protestant Reformers; but he won for himself among free-thinkers of the last century the reputation of a pioneer of intellectual emancipation by presaging the substitution of the worship of the Christian God by the adoration of a deified humanity. Those who accepted Swedenborg as a religious, as distinct from a merely philosophical teacher, formed themselves into an organization known as the New Jerusalem Church or New Church. Its main stronghold was in Lancashire; but it was never a numerous body. Though there is no evidence that Swedenborg was ever initiated into Freemasonry his doctrines influenced the movement and a so-called Swedenborgian rite of "illuminized" Freemasonry was founded in papal territory at Avignon about 1760 by a Frenchman, the Marquis de Thome. Swedenborg's influence continued into the nineteenth century, and gifted women like Margaret Fuller, the American social worker, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning came under it. The latter affirmed that she had been led to Spiritualism through her interest in Swedenborg.

The other eighteenth-century precursor of Spiritualism, the Viennese physician Franz Anton Mesmer (1733-1815), was a man of a different type from Swedenborg. He was not the first to make use of therapeutic methods unrecognized by the medical profession. In the seventeenth century Valentine Greatrakes, a physician of Irish birth, and a Rosicrucian, claimed to bring about cures by stroking his patients. A few persons seem to have derived benefit from his treatment, but on the whole his success seems to have been very limited. Another healer by unorthodox methods was Mesmer's contemporary, the Austrian priest J. J. Gassner. Gassner believed that a far larger proportion of illnesses was due directly to diabolical agency than was generally supposed. To ascertain whether this was so in an individual case he submitted his patients to a "probative exorcism" in which he commanded the evil spirit to

manifest its presence. Only when he considered this to be established did he have recourse to "expulsive exorcism". Gassner's reputation as a healer was known to Mesmer, who asserted that the priest was unconsciously using his own method of cure and was nothing but a tool of Nature. Mesmer, who came to Paris in 1778, believed that there existed a universal vital fluid capable of transference from one organism to another by means of contact, or even, where direct physical contact was lacking, by means of passes such as hypnotists later made use of. This force for which Mesmer claimed curative properties, as well as the power to produce anaesthesia, he named "Animal Magnetism".

Mesmer's patients were so numerous that it became impossible for him to see each one individually. He therefore arranged for them to form a circle round a large tub with metal handles filled with water and magnetic material. The patients grasped the handles and also held each other's hands like sitters with a medium. By this means the health-giving fluid was supposed to pass from one to another. Strains of music accompanied the séance and Mesmer himself officiated, wielding a sort of magician's wand. This, however, seems to have been merely a piece of stage property. Unlike Swedenborg, Mesmer does not seem to have been what is termed a "psychic", and his reputation was not associated with ability to evoke spirits. But the medical profession not unnaturally showed itself to be suspicious of these therapeutic novelties. A royal commission, presided over by Benjamin Franklin, recently appointed United States Minister to France, pronounced unfavourably on Mesmer's methods and he left Paris.¹

During the Revolution and under the Empire his theories were in discredit, but in 1819, four years after his death, they were revived in a modified form by the Abbé José Custodio de Faria. This strange ecclesiastic, who figures in Dumas's novel *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* as a prisoner in the Château d'If, was of Goanese birth and had played a minor part in the drama of the French Revolution. Faria, instead of stressing the idea of an "effluence" or magnetic fluid radiating from the operator to the

¹ Mesmer's *Mémoire sur la Découverte du Magnétisme Animal* has recently been translated into English and published with an introductory monograph by Gilbert Frankau.

patient, emphasized the power of auto-suggestion, a step which led to the recognition of "hypnotism" as something distinct from "mesmerism", an idea brought forward by the Manchester surgeon James Braid in 1843, just five years before the beginnings of modern Spiritualism. Somnambulism, as Hypnotism was at first called, was for a long period thought of as an occult science unworthy of the attention of serious physicians, a view which, according to Richet, prevailed in the hospitals of Paris down to 1875. But when the "Society for Psychical Research" was founded in this country in 1882 an early decision was taken that hypnotic phenomena could be regarded as outside its province and treated as a branch of medicine, although there has been admittedly recognized a close resemblance between the deeper stages of hypnosis and the mediumistic trance. Perhaps the main interest which mesmerism has for the student of Psychical Research lies in the way in which the theory of a "magnetic fluid" was advanced as an explanation of the table-turning which was so popular and fashionable a pastime, especially in Paris in the first years of the Second Empire. The rationalists ascribed the movements of the tables either to unconscious use of their muscles or to clandestine touching on the part of the sitters. Among Catholics the theory that the tables were moved by fallen angels received much support. Into this controversy the Comte Agénor de Gasparin, a Protestant known for his writings against Negro Slavery, intervened with a third theory, founded on a number of experiments which he had carried out. He explained the table-turning (which sometimes took place even when the hands of the circle were not actually in contact with the table) by postulating a kind of magnetic fluid said to operate through the collective will of the circle.

The most complete link between Mesmerism and Spiritualism was the *Poughkeepsie Seer*, Andrew Jackson Davis. The son of a drunken and impoverished New York shoemaker, Davis began at the age of seventeen to submit himself to Hypnotism. While in a hypnotic state he passed into trance, and although he had received next to no education, he delivered a hundred and fifty-seven disquisitions on the philosophy of Occultism. In Davis, who took "flights through psychic space", we encounter the jargon of modern Spiritualism. H. J. T. JOHNSON

A PAROCHIAL FESTIVAL OF
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

"YEARS ago, the only time a parent appeared in school was to have a row with the teacher." So remarked the Archbishop of Birmingham in his speech when he came to open what is believed to have been the first parochial "Festival of Christian Doctrine" to be held in this country. The scene of the Festival was the parish of the Sacred Heart and Holy Souls, Acocks Green, Birmingham, and the date was 26-27 March of this year. The one great fact that emerged from the week-end was that the parents *are* interested in the religious instruction of their children, and, given the necessary help and encouragement, are very willing to co-operate. As His Grace said elsewhere in his speech, the festival represented a remarkable effort of co-operation between clergy, teachers and parents, and it was his hope that it would continue.

For the past thirty years or more a silent revolution in the teaching of religion to children has been carried out in the Birmingham Archdiocese. Always under the guidance of Fr F. H. Drinkwater, who is known throughout the Catholic world as something more than an expert in these matters, the revolution first made itself felt in some of the schools. Later on, the new outlook and methods rapidly captured the Training Colleges and, in recent years, Teachers' refresher courses, held in different centres all over the diocese, have renewed the enthusiasm of the older teachers and provided many new ideas for the younger ones. To all they have been a valuable stimulus.

There remained the family. Good Catholic parents who were glad to have learnt the Catechism well, if painfully, were a little puzzled at some of the things they heard were going on in our schools. They were somewhat distressed when their little Tommy, aged seven, could not rattle off the high-sounding but formidable phrases of the Catechism.¹ This is an important matter, for if parents do not understand what the school is try-

¹ I remember a small boy of six, going to a Convent school, in quite recent years, who took a quite lugubrious delight in repeating on all sorts of inappropriate occasions, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire."

ing to do, there is little chance of co-operation. It would seem that it was out of a situation such as this that the notion of a parish festival of Christian Doctrine sprang. The parish has a vigorous Parent-Teacher Association and at one of its meetings a parent asked, "Why don't you teach children the Catechism now?" The Headmistress answered, "But we do—and you shall see how we do it." So the idea of the Festival was born, though many minds (and hands) subsequently contributed to it.

It was immediately seen that church, family and school must each make its contribution to the final result, though since the primary purpose of the festival was to demonstrate to parents how the school does its work of handing on the Faith, it was obvious that the school would have the biggest part to play. We will deal with that first.

Before coming to details, it will be as well to make one or two preliminary observations. I have used the expression "handing on the Faith" rather than "religious instruction" or "teaching the Catechism", because the word "Faith" can be made to include the totality of Catholic belief, practice and devotion, and it is this that we have to hand on: something that at once satisfies the mind, appeals to the heart and issues in practice. It was fortuitous but all the more impressive that this was a note sounded throughout the week-end. In his opening speech, for instance, the Archbishop said, "It is not sufficient to have the Catechism in our memory, we must understand it and live it"; and again, addressing the parents directly, "Do your best to see that the things taught your child in school are so learned that they will continue to be guides to conduct in future life." Again, this orientation of instruction to practice was demonstrated in most of the material exhibited and in the plays that were acted.

It follows that, since religious instruction concerns the whole of man, and since man is body and spirit, every means, including words—but the right words—must be used to "incarnate" the doctrine in an individual person. This is now an educational platitude, but Fr Drinkwater and his fellow-workers were the first to appreciate its importance, thirty years ago, and to take measures for its realization in religious instruction. It means, incidentally, that the interest of the child must be captured and retained, and His Grace emphasized this point, too:

"One way to make sure that teaching goes in is to make the subjects taught in school so interesting that children leaving school will follow up at least some of them." What struck everyone as they entered the school hall was the beauty and colour, as well as the excellent arrangement, of all the material shown. Dominating the whole room was a huge figure of Our Lord, with arms outstretched, inviting all men to come to him. Underneath was a scene depicting the injunction "Going, therefore, teach . . ." In the same framework, the whole hierarchy of the Church, from the Pope to the parish priest, was represented, showing how Our Lord's injunction is carried out. Supporting this set-piece were the emblems of the various parish auxiliaries which assist in the work of handing on the Faith. There were lovely and impressive shields of the Y.C.W. and the A.P.F., and ingenious diagrams illustrating the work of the Ecclesiastical Education Fund and that of the lay-catechists. The first thing one saw on entering the room was a large and beautiful object-lesson (I can think of nothing else to call it), illustrating the "Christian Way of Life". It was over six feet high and about twelve long and was made up of pictures and cut-out figures, accompanied by handsomely lettered cards (done by a boy), explaining the Commandments and the duties of the Christian life. It was certainly the centre of attraction and a wonderful silent lesson. The rest of the room was gay with posters, some done by the teachers, some by the children, and all round the walls on tables were models, note-books, made and illustrated by the children, and other equipment. One stall, displaying aid-books and other literature used in school, did a very good trade, selling books to *parents*. Senior children were in attendance to explain everything, and one noticed that a certain gadget called Flannelgraph Cut-outs, which enable a child to build up in picture and tell a Gospel story at the same time, was a great success as sheer entertainment. One small boy enjoyed himself telling the parable of the Good Samaritan, adding his own realistic touches as he went along. The impressive thing about all this side of the festival was that it represented a real effort of co-operation between teachers and children. Practically everything shown (there were a few teachers' models, labelled as such) was made either by the children or by teachers and children together.

All this was downstairs. Upstairs (in hopelessly cramped conditions, for it is an old school-building), at stated intervals all through Saturday and Sunday afternoons, various classes from the Infants to the Seniors presented plays and similar activities. The Archbishop, who in his speech had emphasized the importance of providing children with the means of expressing what they already knew, was present for two sessions on the Saturday. Selection is invidious but at least three things stood out from the others. First, the acting by the juniors of "The Altar of God", a mime (with narrative) of the Mass, visibly impressed the parents, whose uncomfortable proximity to the performers in no way disturbed their natural reverence. Another class of juniors held a Brains Trust, conducted entirely by themselves. First they answered questions put by their classmates and then took questions from the audience. The whole thing was vital and exhilarating and demonstrated beyond question that young children can give clear and accurate answers if their minds are not embarrassed by heavy technical terms. The outstanding effort of the seniors was the acting of a number of playlets and dialogues,¹ illustrating Catechism answers, and showing, often wittily, how they can be used in the circumstances of modern life. The acting was natural and easy, and if the last one, "War in Burma—or What Happens Next?" was mostly inaudible, it yet brought the house down. A Catechism Quiz, for which two teams of seniors offered themselves as victims and acquitted themselves very creditably in the nerve-racking conditions, showed that children can quite practicably learn their Catechism between the ages of eleven and fifteen. Three classes of infants made very acceptable contributions in the form of simple plays that were just right for their age.

To conclude the report on the school's contribution, one would like to point out that, though of course the school had to make a special effort to give this exhibition, there was nothing faked about it. Everything, whether work shown or plays acted, was genuine class work of the sort these children are used to doing regularly. It was really the fine fruit of over twenty years' work inspired by the Sower Scheme (now, and since 1930, the

¹ All had been chosen from those printed in *The Sower* (4s. annual subscription, from *The Sower*, Lower Gornal, Dudley).

diocesan Scheme) and using its methods. And that, I think, is a point to be emphasized: as the writers in Père G. Delcuve's vast survey of Religious Instruction in all parts of the Church¹ said years ago, the Sower Scheme is not so much a system or a technique but a life, a spirit, full of light and love, wide open to reality. This was certainly palpable in the bearing and work of the children.

And the parents, what did they do? Well, first, they were there, and in great numbers, overflowing everywhere and into everything, so that at times it was difficult to clear enough floor-space for the children to act on. The parents were there, all Saturday and Sunday afternoons, in spite of its being the heaviest sporting week-end of the year. It was the parents, with their babies and small children hoisted aloft on fathers' shoulders, who gave the whole Festival its popular and "family" character. The cynic may say that of course mothers will come to see little Tommy and little Mary in the limelight. That is perfectly true, except that the cynic is wrong to be cynical. What better motive can there be than pride and interest in the doings of their children to bring parents together so that they may make a *real* contact with Christian truth? At this festival the parents certainly learnt more than their children did. Almost every Christian doctrine and many Catholic practices (there was, for instance, a presentation showing how the Last Sacraments are administered) were demonstrated in one way or another, and parents heard again, perhaps for the first time since they had left school, the familiar phrases of the Catechism. Sermons from the pulpit are notoriously inadequate to do all the work of instruction that is necessary. The Festival had a real missionary effect, reaching people who may rarely come to Mass or hear a sermon, quite apart from the fact that, in the children's homes at least, the festival was the subject of discussion for weeks beforehand.

Not only were the parents there, but they helped. The mothers organized a running buffet, the proceeds of which went to pay the necessary but surprisingly low expenses of the Festival; and the men of the parish moved vast quantities of furniture both before and after the event, and were always there to

¹ *Où en est l'enseignement religieux*, pp. 286, foll. (Paris-Tournai, 1937.)

move chairs and tables when they were required. In addition, they did invaluable work in supervising and directing the crowds.

Naturally, there were disappointments. The weakest Catholics were, I imagine, mostly absent. One or two children did not turn up to take their parts in plays on Sunday afternoon and some of the senior boys did not appear. Yet, all things considered, a very large part of the parish was reached by the Festival.

The parish clergy helped as only they can, by giving the Festival their full support and interest, by making rough ways plain, and by enlisting the services of innumerable parishioners for various jobs. But it should be recorded that it was Fr Drinkwater who seized on the original appeal made to him for help and turned the project into a Christian Doctrine Festival in which church, home and school should not only play their part but should be *seen* to be playing their part, in the handing on of the Faith. As long ago as 1935 the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued a decree asking for the celebration of Christian Doctrine Festivals whose purpose should be "to recall to the minds of priests and people the importance of knowing God, the necessity of religious instruction and all that pertains to our eternal salvation".

Whether this decree was meant to apply primarily to *parish* festivals is not clear, but there can be little doubt that they are likely to be most effective when held in parishes. This was certainly evident at Acocks Green.

If the school was necessarily the centre of interest, on Sunday the parish church appeared in its role as the centre of divine power giving meaning to the whole festival. The most impressive event of the week-end was the Family Mass celebrated at 9.15 on the Sunday morning. As several lay-people said afterwards, "This is what the parish Mass ought to be every Sunday." First, the large church was full and no one was regimented. Parents, many with babies in arms (who were surprisingly quiet), were for the most part with their children; there were of course large concentrations of children among whom were to be found the teachers. Secondly, it was Dialogue Mass, and the children, joined by many of the parents, answered the Latin responses

easily and without fuss. The celebrant spoke distinctly and audibly and gave the congregation time to answer. There was no strain or sense of haste, and the whole effort was a striking demonstration that a Dialogue Mass *can* take place with dignity, and indeed devotion, even in a large church. Schoolboys read the Proper in English at the appropriate moments and did it very well. The reading of the Gospel was particularly pleasing. Notices were short, there was a brief sermon and a second priest assisted the celebrant in giving Holy Communion to the greater part of the congregation. The Mass took no longer than three-quarters of an hour. Certainly an inspiring experience. At all the other Masses, too, the special preacher was in the pulpit, describing the teaching mission of the Church and especially the part the *home* should play in it.

In the evening there was again a family service. What was impressive was that practically the whole body of parents moved as one man from the school to the church when the time for Evening Service came. Again, one had the happy spectacle of parents, children and teachers, all mixed up, forming a pattern that reminded one of the Feeding of the Five Thousand in the Gospel. The service, in English (of which everyone had a copy), was based on Compline and the congregation recited the psalms antiphonally and with hardly a discordant voice. The children had, of course, been trained and they led the rest. A priest was in the pulpit to "conduct" the service, though fortunately he had not to resort to cheironomy. After the night prayers the priest spoke for two or three minutes, underlining the lessons of the festival, and then Solemn Benediction followed. All the singing was good, brisk and kept together by an understanding organist, and the last hymn, *O God of earth and altar*, firmly and vigorously sung, brought the Festival to an end on an appropriate note of enthusiasm.

No doubt the practical will want to know what were the results. Did lapsed Catholics come back? Are parents instructing their children by the fireside? saying night prayers? The present writer is not in a position to say, and it would be folly to expect much from a single effort. These festivals must go on, being repeated in the same parish from time to time. What was aimed at was certainly achieved: the life of the school and

the life of the Church were brought right into the home, and we can be confident that lasting impressions were made on the parents which will produce results not measurable by any earthly statistics.

J. D. CRICHTON

MULTIPLICATION TABLES

THE PROGRESS OF CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND AND
WALES. 1702-1949

<i>Year</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Total Population</i>
1702	27,696	—	—	6,000,000
1780	69,376	392	(200)	7,000,000
1803	70,000	—	—	10,000,000
1824	—	—	389	12,000,000
1842	900,000 (including Scotland)	624	487	16,000,000
1914	2,100,446	3,872	1,837	36,000,000
1930	2,174,673	4,349	2,205	38,000,000
1949	2,648,900	6,610	2,821	42,850,000 (1946)

THE above table is a summary of the statistics available for a survey of the growth of Catholicism in England and Wales from 1702 until the present day. There has not been any census of religious beliefs, so the estimates of the numbers of Catholics during these years are based on the figures given by individuals or found in reports made to Parliament. The *Catholic Directory* gives much invaluable information; in 1824 it began to give the total number of chapels and churches, and in 1839 the number of priests in England and Wales. Yet it was not until 1913 that it gave the total Catholic population for England and Wales.

The sources of the statistics in the above table will be quoted in the course of this survey, which seeks to estimate the number of Catholics, priests, chapels and churches in England and Wales in 1800, 1851, 1900, and 1949. For each of these four years the estimates are first tabulated, and then they are discussed in some detail. To make the picture more clear figures are also quoted to show the progress of Catholicism in Italy, France, and the United States.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND AND
WALES. 1702-1800

<i>Year</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Churches</i>
1702	27,696	—	—
1800	100,000	400	200
<i>Increase 1702-1800</i> —	72,304	—	—

In 1949 there were 2,648,900 Catholics in England and Wales.¹ Two hundred and forty-six years ago on the death of William III a document was found giving the number of Catholics as 13,856.² These latter were freeholders and the actual total of Catholics for 1702 is estimated at 27,696.³ This was the darkest hour for Catholicism in England and Wales, for after 1688 the struggle was apparently given up. Eighty years later, in 1780, when the total population of the country was 7,000,000, a Government estimate puts the number of Catholics at about 70,000, or exactly one per cent of the total population.³ At this time there were 392 priests in England and Wales,⁴ and probably just less than 200 chapels and churches for the Catholics. For there were 170 private chapels, and public churches in Wor-

¹ This figure from the *Catholic Directory* of 1949 is possibly an under-estimate, as is shown later.

² *The Position of the Catholic Church in England and Wales*, by T. Murphy, p. 59. (Burns & Oates, London, 1892.)

³ A return made to the House of Lords in 1780.

⁴ *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy*, by Maziere Brady. (London, 1883.)

cester, Preston, Shrewsbury, Corbridge, Garstang, Manchester, Newcastle, Norwich and Liverpool.¹ We can conclude with reasonable accuracy that at the end of the eighteenth century, one hundred and fifty years ago, there were some 70,000 Catholics, about 400 priests, and just under 200 churches and chapels in England and Wales.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND AND
WALES. 1800-1851

<i>Date</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Total Population</i>
1800	70,000	400	200	10,000,000
1851	1,000,000	826	586	17,927,609
<i>Increase 1800-1851</i> —	930,000	426	386	7,927,000

From the turn of the century the figures available tell a story of the gradual growth of Catholicism. By 1851, at the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century, the number of priests had increased by one hundred per cent to 826, and the chapels and churches by three hundred per cent to 586. But the growth of the Catholic population is still more remarkable. In 1842 Bishop Griffiths, writing to the priest in charge of the German church in London, estimated the Catholic population of Great Britain as 900,000, out of a total population of 19,000,000.² So by this time the Catholics were one in twenty of the population. The Bishop also gives the conversion rate as two to three thousand per year. It is worth noting that this figure of 900,000 was given before the conversion of Newman, and before the greatest of the Irish famines led to a big increase in the number

¹ A Government estimate for 1801 lists 156 Catholic chapels. For a fuller discussion of these figures see:

Murphy, *op. cit.*; Husenbeth's *Life of Milner*, p. 91. (London, 1862.)

Rev J. Keating, in *The Month*, January 1929.

Rev J. Morris, in *The Month*, March 1891.

² Bishop Ward, *Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*. Vol. II, p. 96.

of Catholic immigrants. Thus we can estimate that in 1851 there were at least one million Catholics in England and Wales. That this is no exaggeration will be seen from the letter written by Father Dominic Barberi in 1844, in which he says that in Liverpool alone the Catholics numbered 80,000, seventy-five per cent of whom were Irish immigrants. The same writer in another letter written in 1845 said there were 100,000 Catholics in Manchester.¹ Bishop Griffiths estimated the Catholic population of London as 200,000 in 1843.² In three cities, then, we have almost 400,000 Catholics. As a result of the Oxford Movement and the increase of immigration from Ireland after the famines of 1845-1847 the Catholic population of England and Wales in 1850 may be reckoned as one million.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND AND
WALES. 1851-1900

<i>Year</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Total Population</i>
1851	1,000,000	826	586	17,927,609
1900	2,000,000	2,830	1,760	32,527,843
<i>Increase 1851-1900</i>	—	1,000,000	2,004	1,174
				14,600,234

The rapid growth in the numbers of priests, faithful and churches continued in the second half of the nineteenth century. By 1900 the number of priests was 2830, an increase of 2000 over 1851; the number of churches and chapels had increased to 1760, an increase of more than 1000 over 1851.³ It is not easy, however, to assess the number of Catholics at the beginning of the twentieth century, but we can work out a fairly accurate figure. Between 1850 and 1900 the population of England and Wales increased by seventy-five per cent. We can take it, there-

¹ Denis Gwynn, *The Second Spring*, p. 165. (London, 1942.)

² Bishop Ward, *Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, Vol. I, p. 177.

³ Figures from the *Catholic Directory* for these dates.

fore, that the Catholic population increased by seventy-five per cent also. A seventy-five-per-cent increase on 1,000,000 gives us a total of 1,750,000. But this is not the sum total of Catholics. The number of Catholic immigrants from Ireland during this period was at the very least half a million. The sum total of Catholics will therefore be about 2,250,000.¹ We can allow for a twelve-and-a-half-per-cent "leakage" and still be left with a Catholic population of 2,000,000. This may appear at first sight to be an over-estimate, as the 1914 figure given in the *Catholic Directory* is only 2,100,000, but, as will be shown later, this figure is probably an under-estimate, so that any conclusion drawn by working back from it will be an under-estimate too. The general conclusion, then, for the beginning of the twentieth century is that there were in England and Wales 1760 churches and chapels, with 2830 priests, and a Catholic population of 2,000,000.

PROGRESS OF CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND AND
WALES. 1900-1949

<i>Year</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Total Population</i>
1900	2,000,000	2,830	1,760	32,527,843
1949	2½-4,000,000	6,610	2,821	42,850,000 (1946)
<i>Increase 1900-1949</i> —	½-2,000,000	3,780	1,061	10,000,000

It is apparently easy to give the statistics for the last fifty years, as we have the figures in the *Catholic Directory*, but a footnote in the recent editions of this directory says, "The exact figures of Catholic Populations in the various dioceses are not available. All the figures given under this heading are approximate." Thus the figures given for the Catholic population need examination. The first official estimate of the number of Catho-

¹ The precise figure would be somewhat smaller, as the Catholic immigrants account for a small part of the seventy-five-per-cent overall increase.

lics in England and Wales was given in the 1914 edition of the *Catholic Directory* as 2,100,446, and the 1949 edition gives the present figure as 2,648,900. Secular priests number 4263, and Regulars number 2347, a total of 6610 priests. The number of churches and chapels is 2821. Thus over the last fifty years the number of chapels and churches has increased by more than fifty per cent, the number of priests by more than 133 per cent, whilst the Catholic population has increased (according to the Directory figures) by twenty-five per cent. So we can calculate that Catholics number one in sixteen of the total population, and that mathematically speaking there is one priest for every 400 Catholics. The proportion of one in sixteen seems very disappointing when we remember that one hundred years ago the proportion was one in twenty, and that it is estimated that even at the end of Elizabeth's reign the proportion was still one in three, and that it was more than one in ten under Charles II.¹ It is not surprising, then, that many statisticians have looked twice at the *Catholic Directory* figures for the Catholic population to see if they are really accurate. The case against these figures is well put by Dr W. A. Zybszewski, who gives his reasons for thinking the Catholic population of England and Wales to be ten per cent of the total population.² He shows how according to the figures in the *Catholic Directory* the Catholic population dropped from 5.8 to 5.6 per cent of the total population in the years 1939 to 1946, and this in spite of a Catholic birth-rate seventy-five per cent above the average, and an annual conversion rate of over 10,000. An abnormally high Catholic death-rate or a great increase in the "leakage" could account for this drop, but there is no evidence for either. The simplest explanation is that the figures in the *Catholic Directory* are inaccurate, and there is evidence to back this explanation. A Gallup poll, taken by the *News Review* in November 1946, gave the Catholic population as 8.7 per cent of the total population . . . a fifty per cent increase on the Directory figures. Army chaplains found that Catholics serving in the forces were usually one tenth of the total number serving. But the strongest argument is based on a study of the Catholic birth-rate. Catholic births are one tenth

¹ Cf. Leo Hicks, in *The Month*, August 1938.

² In *The Tablet*, 6 March, 1948.

of the total number of births; the Catholic birth-rate is in fact only slightly above the average, and, therefore, Dr Zybszewski concludes, Catholics are one tenth of the total population; that is, they number about 4,000,000.

The statistics for the growth of Catholicism over the years 1702-1900 seem to give some practical ground for supporting this conclusion. If we accept the *Catholic Directory* figures, then we must also accept that the gradual growth of Catholicism in England and Wales since the relaxation of the penal laws has been arrested for the first time in our own day, when there are more Catholic churches and priests than at any time since the Reformation. Dr Zybszewski's final estimate of 4,000,000 may seem to be too high, since it takes no account of "mixed" marriages in its calculations, but his general conclusion stands firm: there are more Catholics in England and Wales than would appear from the *Catholic Directory*. It is possible to understand why this should be so if we remember that the *Catholic Directory* figure is an approximation, and that it does not include all those who would register as Catholics if a religious census were to be taken. So until such a religious census gives us a definite figure, we can be content to estimate that there are some 4,000,000 Catholics in England and Wales today.

This statistical survey of the growth of Catholicism in England and Wales is thrown into relief when we examine the statistics that can be found for other countries. The following table gives the figures for priests and Catholics in Italy over the last ninety years.

Year	Total (Catholic) Population	Secular Priests	Priests/Catholics
1861 ..	21,777,334	87,774	1 / 250
1901 ..	32,475,253	68,844	1 / 450
1921 ..	38,133,000	55,633	1 / 600
1936 ..	42,444,588	47,331	1 / 900
1948 ..	44,990,925	44,777	1 / 1,000

In 1861 the population of Italy (almost a hundred per cent Catholic) was 21,777,334, and the secular clergy numbered 87,774. Thus there was one priest for every 250 Catholics. Since that time the Catholic population has become greater year by year, whilst the numbers of clergy have fallen steadily. In 1900 the proportion of priests to people was 1 to 450; in 1920 it was 1 to 600. The last available figures give the total population as 44,990,925 (of which 99.6 per cent is Catholic), and the secular clergy as numbering 44,777. This works out at one secular priest to every 1000 Catholics. Thus over the last ninety years the number of Catholics in Italy has doubled, and the number of secular priests has fallen by half.¹ As early as 1885 Bertolotti pointed out in *Statistica Ecclesiastica d'Italia* that in the preceding five years 11,559 priests had died, and only 5000 had been ordained, so that there was a deficit of 6050. This trend has continued, and so today there are fewer priests, and their general age level is higher. In 1911 only a quarter of the priests were in the 45-64 age group. Twenty years later, in 1931, well over one half were in this age group.²

We can conclude, therefore, that there has been a great falling off of vocations to the priesthood in Italy over the last ninety years, and that whilst in England and Wales the number of secular priests has been increased five times, in Italy their number has been halved. Consequently whereas ninety years ago Italy had one secular priest for every 250 Catholics and England and Wales had one priest for every 1200 Catholics, today Italy has one secular priest per thousand Catholics, whilst England and Wales have (according to the *Catholic Directory*) one secular priest for every 600 Catholics.³ And as there are in England and Wales more regular clergy doing pastoral work, comparatively speaking, than in Italy, the proportion for England and Wales is probably one priest for every 500 Catholics. In a way, then, we in England and Wales are twice as well off for priests as the Catholics are in Italy.

¹ The figures for 1861-1938 are from *Vocazioni Sacerdotali*, by Father Filograssi, Rome, 1944. The figures for 1948 are taken from *Ephemerides Louvanienses*, 1948. In his booklet Father Filograssi quotes the results of a research on vocations in Italy, carried out by T. Salvemini. Salvemini's publication is at present unobtainable.

² Filograssi, *op. cit.*

³ General experience will lead many to question this proportion. It is another pointer that the *Catholic Directory* underestimates the Catholic population.

The state of Catholicism in France has recently become the subject of much scientific research.¹ Here we can give briefly a summary of what has happened there over the last two hundred years. In the eighteenth century, when Catholicism in England and Wales was at its lowest ebb, the majority of the peasants and craftsmen of France were practising Catholics, whilst the middle and upper classes had lost the Faith. In the nineteenth century many of these latter returned to the Church, whilst the workers began to desert it. Today the picture is very complicated. There are zones where Catholicism flourishes, and there are others that have been aptly termed "missionary territories" because they have lost the Faith. Then there are the numerous categories between these extremes. Remarkable figures can be quoted to show the dechristianization of certain dioceses in France.²

DIOCESE OF BAYEUX

<i>Year</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Priests</i>	<i>Parishes</i>
1900	403,000	800	716
1936	399,000	419	727
1946	—	346	717

From this table it is seen that there are 454 fewer priests in the diocese than at the beginning of the century. Out of the 717 parishes 454 are without priests. About half the priests are over sixty years old, and the numbers in the seminary are still falling.

Another diocese, Dijon, has 250 priests for 727 parishes. Here, too, half the priests are over sixty. Not all the dioceses are so badly off, but the general story is the same. For in 1888 there were 1700 priests ordained, whereas in 1930 the number ordained was 700. Paris in 1930 had two priests for every 10,000 Catholics; Marseilles had three per 10,000, and Bordeaux had five per 10,000. The proportion of priests to Catholics in 1930

¹ Books giving statistics on Catholicism in France are too many to enumerate. Gabriel Le Bras has a good introduction to the position. See his *Introduction à l'histoire de la pratique religieuse en France*. (Paris, 1942.)

² *Guide de la France Chrétienne et Missionnaire*, 1948.

was one to 1200.¹ Since that time the number of secular priests has fallen by 4000.² And so it has come about that 250 Dutch priests have volunteered to work in France, since there are 13,000 parishes there without priests.³ A comparison with France, therefore, shows us that whilst in England and Wales Catholicism has become stronger over the last 200 years, in France it has apparently been losing ground.

One last comparison. From the *American Catholic Directory* we learn that the annual rate of conversions in America is 100,000. This is one conversion for every 1000 non-Catholics, and it is four times the rate for England and Wales. Catholicism seems to be pushing ahead more in the United States than in England and Wales.

These, then, are some of the statistics available for a study of the growth of Catholicism in England and Wales since the unhappy days of persecution. They are sufficient to show how real has been the progress of Catholicism since the beginning of the last century, and to encourage those who are working for the conversion of these countries today.

ROBERT L. CARSON.

THE FAMILY CRUSADE

A SUGGESTION to introduce yet another parochial association might well be disturbing both to priest and layfolk. Already numerous guilds, confraternities, sodalities, and societies compete for membership, often overlap in objects, and cover almost every conceivable need. The Secular Third Orders, the Blessed Sacrament Guild, Children of Mary, Legion of Mary, S.V.P., the Grail, A.P.F. and Holy Childhood, confraternities of all kinds as well as federations, Knights, and societies less professedly spiritual in aim—all these and more could be

¹ These figures for 1930 are taken from Doncœur, in *Études*, Vol. 68, 1931.

² Streit, in *Atlas Hierarchicus*, 1929, gives the secular clergy as numbering 48,000, and the *Annuario Pontificio* for 1948 gives 43,990.

³ *Osservatore Romano*, 28 November, 1948.

catalogued, without attempt at noting precedence even if that were possible.

All objects being ostensibly catered for, any proposed new Catholic association must meet a challenge to show its justification. But it must be remembered that the need and objects of religious associations accord with the times which give them birth. This is true in the first place of Religious Orders and Congregations in the strict sense. Though there may be a surface similarity between certain foundations, they nearly all supply a specific need; their "spirit" or inspiration is different. The same is so in a measure of lesser societies within the Church. The mediaeval crafts guilds, for instance, grew out of the need and spirituality of the times. Although they were trade associations, they were nevertheless religious, for the Middle Ages knew no divorce between social and religious duties, between religion and economics. That crafts guilds may yet be revived is the earnest wish of all who have the re-christianizing of society at heart, from the Holy Father downwards. Meanwhile, professional guilds of a different kind but with Christian ideals are everywhere being established. They may represent steps, though remote ones, towards the re-establishing of crafts guilds, which are an essential factor in a Christian society. But while, in general, there is much talk of social planning and the implementing of the Papal Encyclicals, little seems to be done about preparing the ground. We may not as yet have the power as Catholics of carrying out many of the reforms for which there is crying need. But one thing we can begin to do: we can begin at the beginning. We can begin with the family, which, in the Pope's scheme as in nature, is the basic unit. Because it is the basic unit of society, so in social planning the family must be first restored.

It is just here that the need seems to be pointed for a new Catholic association. We have, it may be objected, a Confraternity of the Holy Family, whose end is to "to honour the Holy Family, Jesus, Mary, and Joseph; and to give to the faithful of every age, sex, and condition powerful means of advancing securely in the way of salvation". But while this confraternity, with its history of over a hundred years, is an immense force for good, its appeal is for our times too much to the converted.

No longer may we legislate merely for the preservation of the family; rather we have to work for its restoration, for the family ideal has been lost. A society for restoring the family may not assume a level of family piety; it must begin by emphasizing that the family itself is fundamental.

If society is to be re-christianized, it is the family, the unit of society, that needs to be spiritually re-infused. Without solid and substantial components the social edifice can never be raised. The whole trend of modern social development is to despise the family and to substitute the State. That is very much like trying to build without bricks or their equivalent, and is just as much doomed to fail. But it will do much harm both in the attempt and failure, because it contravenes God's law which insists upon the sanctity and inviolability of the family.

If any new association is needed, it may well be one that aims at restoring the Christian and Catholic family. But such an association raises difficulties peculiar to itself. It is essentially a lay association, whereas Catholic Action demands the participation of the laity with the Apostolic Hierarchy. That is, of course, not to say that such an association could be intended to run independently of the ecclesiastical authorities. It is merely an indication that its particular object, the sanctification of the home, being essentially the province of layfolk, would cause it to have a large measure of lay organization. There would thus be a tendency to a onesidedness, out of keeping with the vigorous campaign of Catholic Action that the times require, whether under that name or not.

A similar difficulty has been experienced by the comparatively newly founded Catholic Parents' Association, in some dioceses called the Catholic Parents' and Electors' Association. The object of this association, it is true, is not specifically the restoration of family life. It was established primarily to deal with the dangers to Catholic schools arising from the Education Bill of 1943, afterwards passed into law with some modification but no real recognition of Catholic claims. The initiators of the Association emphasized that past education crises had been met, as they arose, by other Catholic bodies, but that it was desirable that there should be a permanent association of parents, whose proper business it was to be ready to defend their rights.

The inviolability of the parental right in education was much stressed by the late Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., some of whose sayings on the subject sounded startling at the time because the education question had had little occasion to be popularly thrashed out. His, however, was eminently sound doctrine, and the principle is clearly stated in Pope Pius XI's Encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri*, it being always understood that the parent's right can be lawfully exercised only in close co-operation with and under the "maternal supervision" of the Church.

Nevertheless, the parent's right in education is one thing; the organizing of Catholic parents for the defence of their rights another. It is obvious that a crusade against educational injustice could not be carried on by parents without ecclesiastical approval and direction. To all the various Catholic Parents' Associations, moreover, other adults than parents are admitted, the provision for such membership being obvious in those which included "electors" in their title. A body of laymen, acting in the name of Catholic parents, legitimate though their claims might be, is necessarily subject to Catholic and consequent ecclesiastical discipline.

Catholic loyalty has never questioned the due subordination of the lay society. But it is apt to make for a certain cumber-someness in procedure. The Hierarchy will normally be better able to judge at any particular time what particular action should be taken. It may even be better equipped for urgent action when needed than a scattered body whose forces can be rallied probably only after considerable delay. Simultaneous action of Hierarchy with laity may well prove usually out of the question. The rank and file may lose the sense of being militant, and so become discouraged, forgetting that their existence as an association makes for strength of the Catholic cause, and may be made the opportunity of learning more about their rights and duties as parents, and of mutual encouragement.

Such difficulties have been largely overcome by a wide extension of the objects of the Association. Apart from study and defence of the rights, duties, and powers of parents in education, these now include the attempt to further the application of Christian principles to social questions as they affect the

family, the supervision of Catholic youth activities, the encouraging of Catholics to play their part in civic life, and the deepening of the spiritual life of the members through the practice of family prayer and in other ways.

These objects, although they are not in themselves a professed Family Crusade, seem nevertheless to contain the nucleus. But a campaign for family restoration could hardly be resolutely developed as long as it remained a side issue. We have to admit that the Catholic Parents' Association is not well equipped to sustain it as long as its main preoccupation is with education as an external activity.

The method of the Family Crusade needs to be, first of all, an emphasis on its strictly sociological basis. It can, and should, be represented as the first step in the campaign against Communism. If that implies that we are only on the first step and not even firmly on that, we need not deny it. We have sorrowfully to admit that we are hopelessly backward in combating the enemy, and in heeding our Chief Shepherds who have been warning us for the last hundred years against the wolves in our midst. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the fight would have been lost long ago were it merely a wrestling against flesh and blood. Our victory, when it comes, as come it ultimately must, will not be through human striving. The family ideal may have been lost, but the Holy Family is the guarantee of its reality. The Holy Family must always be the inspiration of a new access of family life somewhere. And as long as it remains the conscious ideal of some Catholic families, its light and beauty must radiate, and there is hope for the world.

But how is this Family Crusade to be launched on its more devotional side? In this country, it may well be done in the first place by encouraging devotion to St Thomas More, the family man who stood, with St John Fisher, the bishop, against the totalitarian aggression of Henry VIII. It is the glorious boast of the laity that they are thus represented equally with the clergy in the stand even to death for the purity of the Faith. They share that honour with the layman to whom was given a percipience in doctrine, enabling him to arrive at the truth to which even some theologians remained blind. And it was in the family that this martyr became sanctified.

But even if we do not advert to this Saint in our scheme, the practices which stamped his family as pre-eminently Catholic and holy can still be applied. We should aim, for instance, at restoring family prayers. And if it be aiming too high to adopt, say, the practice of family spiritual reading (in particular, the reading of a portion of the Sacred Passion every Friday), yet the whole campaign itself is one of high ideals, and such a practice may, to begin with, be taken up by the few to whom it appeals. There is also the appropriate celebration of feast days: the displaying in the home of pictures, which can be changed according to the feast or season.

A shrine in the home would be almost elementary to the campaign. This could be of Our Blessed Lord, Our Lady, or some favourite Saint. But the Enthronement of the Sacred Heart has been so widely recommended and promulgated as a specific family devotion that it might well take precedence, and perhaps ought to do so, in the Family Crusade. It should not, however, be imposed on homes which have a traditional preference or prior occupant of the place of honour. And since the campaign is for the family, the Christmas Crib will necessarily be encouraged as a feature.

The blessing of the home would, of course, be advocated, and its periodical renewal recommended, provided always that there was no undue encroachment on the time of the priest. Another practice that might well be embodied is that of the Family Mass Crusade, though there must be no suggestion of appropriating the functions of this, or any other, body. Such definite manifestations of corporate family devotion are equally, and sometimes better, emphasized and encouraged by their being the speciality of separate organizations. Any enlargement of such an association to embrace the full Family Crusade would need to come from within, though it is probable that those of such bodies which are well established in the promotion of their specific object will remain content to leave the wider objects to a new organization.

An essential in the success of the Family Crusade will be its promotion through the Catholic school. The interest of teachers should be secured, so that the recommended practices can be explained to the children. In this way not only will the seeds be

sown of family reverence in the parents of the future, but it may well be that many children will, through such training, become present-day Crusaders in their own homes. The youth club, too, presents a vast field for Crusade promotion, dependent on the enthusiasm for it of club leaders.

Another excellent means of advancing the Family Crusade is the parochial magazine. This may well become the formal recognized medium for recommending the practices, and for giving information about the Crusade and its progress, and even for the interchange of ideas between families and parishes. The question arises here as to how far the Crusade should be parochial, and what measures should be taken for linking up the various parishes in its organization. Obviously, there can be little enthusiasm, and the Crusade element will be lacking, if the campaign become too parochially self-contained. At the same time, since it is the family that is being catered for, the work will be done chiefly in the larger family, which is the parish. The solution may lie in the interchange which the parish magazine, or a Crusade inset or periodical leaflet, could provide, together with occasional regional meetings.

Apart from these, however, and in each parish perhaps an initial meeting to explain the scheme, gatherings should be as far as possible avoided. It is often the weakness of organizations that they demand endless committee and general meetings, and that enthusiasm wanes precisely because most people have not the time to attend them. It would, moreover, be fatal to the success of a professedly family campaign to require those who support it to spend their time away from the family in favour of the meeting. The real work is to be done not in public but at home.

We may profitably enquire at this stage how far the scheme satisfies the requirements of Catholic Action; whether in its operation the difficulty of close co-operation between priest and laity is too great. Since it is suggested that meetings should be few, what systematic contact between the Crusade as primarily a lay organization and the priest can be adopted?

For this, something more is needed than the printed word, which is not sufficiently reciprocal. The contact needs to be a personal one, and it is best effected by the appointment of liaison

officers between priest and Crusaders. These officers may be regarded as "apostles", and it would be most appropriate if each parish priest were to appoint twelve, or groups of twelve, though fewer would suffice if necessary. They should be picked laymen whose business it would be to explain the Crusade and its practices, encourage families to join it, and to keep enthusiasm alive. They would be in constant touch with the priest and each other, receiving his instructions and advice regarding operations, and reporting to him the success of the Crusade. They could, if thought desirable, each have distinct duties, but it would probably be found preferable for each to be allocated a separate section of the parish for supervision.

The appointing of apostles is appropriate, for no activity can properly be Catholic unless it be apostolic. Although this will apply in particular to their duties as promoters, the whole Crusade as well must be apostolic in conception if it is to succeed. The influence of the family does not stop at itself. Bethlehem and Nazareth have inspired the Christian world for nearly two thousand years, and will continue to do so for all time. The family that models itself on Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, even if as yet it reaches only a low degree of imitation, will give to its neighbours something of the sanctity of Christ. Though the Family Crusade does not specifically work for the conversion of non-Catholics, yet the restoration of the family is bound to have that enormous and happy result through the regeneration of society to which it is bound to contribute.

To sanctify the family is to make it Christlike, and only in the truly Catholic family is the real resemblance to the Holy Family possible. A campaign for the restoration of family life is the practical answer to the State proprietorship to which Communism pretends. We shall deservedly fail if we attempt to adapt Christian social principles to fit a corrupt social system. That way, the principles are whittled away, and the system made still more corrupt. We shall succeed only by putting first things first and building on the solid foundation of the family.

There may be better methods of achieving this than that outlined in this article. Doubtless, any scheme will be improved in operation. But that the attempt must be made in some way, and without delay, is imperative with the passing of the cen-

tenary of the Communist manifesto. The declared enemies of the family are already far advanced in their plans. The Family Crusade is urgently needed for the salvation of society.

C. J. WOOLLEN

THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF ENGLAND

VI. ENGLAND DIVIDED INTO FOUR VICARIATES

(Continued)

D. THE WESTERN DISTRICT

- 1688-1705. Michael Ellis, O.S.B., Bp of Aureliopolis.
- 1713-1750. Matthew Prichard, O.S.F., Bp of Myra.
- 1750-1770. Laurence York, O.S.B., Bp of Nisibi.
- 1770-1797. Charles Walmesley, O.S.B., Bp of Rama.
- 1797-1808. Gregory Sharrock, O.S.B., Bp of Telmessia.
- 1809-1829. Bernardine Collingridge, O.S.F., Bp of Thespi.
- 1829-1843. Augustine Baines, O.S.B., Bp of Siga.

IT will be observed that all the Vicars Apostolic of this District were regulars,¹ and this fact gave it a somewhat distinctive character of its own, and also to some extent lessened the contact of its bishops with those of the other Districts; in the nature of things they were not always so closely concerned with matters which for the other bishops were urgent, e.g. that of the resettlement in England of the Colleges abroad for the training of the secular clergy. But though all these bishops were regulars, there was no rule to the effect that only a regular could be appointed to the Western District, nor even any understanding to that effect. Indeed on the death of Bishop Ellis the Holy See appointed a secular priest, Andrew Giffard (brother of Bishop Giffard of the London District), and when he refused the appointment yet another secular priest was chosen, though he

¹ Though Bishop Baines is said by some to have become secularized after his appointment to the Vicariate.

also did not actually become Vicar Apostolic. Moreover when, some seventy years later, Bishop Walmsley applied for a Coadjutor and suggested the names of three Benedictines for the post, Rome was annoyed and asked whether there was no suitable secular priest available.¹ Still, the Holy See seems to have recognized that there was a certain fitness in one of the Vicariates being entrusted to the regulars in recognition of their long-standing labours on the Mission, the number of regulars who had won the palm of Martyrdom in England, and also the very prominent part they had played in pre-Reformation England when many of the bishoprics were filled by them. And indeed this appears to be borne out by the circumstances of Dr Walmsley's own appointment, as will be related further on.

Of all the forty-six Vicars Apostolic who ruled in England it is safe to say that none (not even Bishop Ullathorne) had stranger antecedents or a more varied career than had Bishop Ellis, the first Vicar Apostolic of the Western District. Philip Michael Ellis was the son of a Protestant clergyman and had five brothers who followed curiously diverse paths. The eldest became Under-Secretary to William III, while the second took the opposite course of being Secretary of State to King William's rival, the exiled James II. Another was Marshal of the King's Bench in England, while the remaining two became Protestant clergymen, one of them being made Protestant Bishop of Killala in Ireland, and subsequently Bishop of Meath. It was certainly a family with diverse views.

Young Philip was educated at Westminster School, where he was universally known as "Jolly Phil", and this sobriquet clung to him throughout life. While still at school he was converted to Catholicism, and when eighteen he went overseas to

¹ The incident is thus rather amusingly described in Kirk's *Biographies of English Catholics*: After saying that Rome did not like the fact that Bishop Walmsley had presented the names of three Benedictines, Kirk proceeds: "Propaganda therefore wrote to Mr Challoner (i.e. the Bishop) to desire an answer to the following three queries: 1. Does Mr Walmsley really want a Coadjutor? 2. What is the character of the three presentees? 3. Is there no secular fit to be presented? To all which queries the old gentleman replied in order: 1. That he did not think Mr Walmsley really wanted an assistant. 2. That the presentees were all unknown to him and his. 3. That a secular would never be agreeable to Mr Walmsley nor would any secular choose to be an assistant to him. From all which he concluded it better to put a *niente* on his petition." None the less the Bishop got his Benedictine Coadjutor in the person of Dr Sharrock.

become a Benedictine at St Gregory's Monastery, Douay (the community of which are now at Downside). There he was still unofficially "Jolly Phil", though in religion he was known as Brother Michael. After ordination he was sent to England and there his outstanding abilities brought him to the notice of James II at whose request he was chosen to be the first Vicar Apostolic of the Western District in 1688 at the early age of thirty-six.¹ But there speedily followed the Revolution, whereupon Ellis was imprisoned in Newgate (along with Bishop Giffard), but being soon released, he joined James II in France, and later went on to Rome where he became a close friend of Cardinal Howard. Unhappily he was never able to return to England, for James II would not give his consent, and so the remainder of his days were spent in Italy, his Vicariate being meanwhile administered by Bishop Giffard on his behalf. But in 1705 he thought it best to resign the Vicariate altogether, and thereupon followed perhaps the strangest phase of his career, for he was immediately appointed by Pope Clement XI to the bishopric of Segni in the Campagna. There he ruled for twenty-one years, and is still remembered both for the seminary which he founded and fostered there, and for the Synod which he held in 1710 in his cathedral, and of which the Acts were ordered to be published by the Pope. The seminary had been attempted in vain by several of his predecessors, but he established it at his own expense by rebuilding an abandoned monastery; and there his body now lies. And so the English Protestant schoolboy ended up as Bishop of an Italian diocese.

On the resignation of Bishop Ellis in 1705 there followed an eight-year vacancy of the Western District. The other three Vicars Apostolic put forward no less than eight names between them, all seculars, and one of these, Andrew Giffard, brother of Bishop Giffard of London, was chosen by Rome, but he declined the appointment. Then another secular, not one of the above eight, Gerard Saltmarsh by name, was selected, but owing to accusations (apparently unfounded) of Jansenism, his Briefs of appointment were never published. Meanwhile the Queen-

¹ There is at Belmont Abbey, Hereford, an old printed copy of a sermon preached by him before James II, his Queen (Mary of Modena), and the Queen Dowager (Catherine of Braganza, widow of Charles II), in the chapel of St James's Palace.

Mother (Mary of Modena) was trying to have a regular appointed, and suggested first a Benedictine, Dom Bernard Gregson (President-General of the English Benedictines), and later a Franciscan, Matthew Prichard, who eventually was appointed (1717). He was a professor at Louvain, and is described as learned and prudent. A native of Monmouthshire (his family lived halfway between Monmouth and Abergavenny), he lived for most of his episcopate at Perthyre in that county. As may be imagined, the fact that there had been no bishop resident in the Western District ever since its inception twenty-five years earlier meant that a vast amount of work awaited the new Vicar Apostolic. Also the Catholics in his District were fewer and more widely scattered than in any of the other Vicariates, and this involved much hardship, fatigue, and danger for him in travelling, especially in Wales where he spent most of his time. It also meant that the Bishop was poorer than his episcopal colleagues and had thus great difficulty in advancing the cause of religion, or indeed in supplying his own personal needs, although in both 1721 and 1723 a small subsidy to relieve his immediate wants was sent to him by the Holy Father. It should be borne in mind that the Vicariate was very large, comprising twenty counties, and stretching 180 miles from east to west; while the persecution was incessant. Thus in 1747 the Bishop's Coadjutor, Dr York, reporting to Rome, declared: "We are compelled to fly from house to house and from city to city. Bishop Prichard is infirm, and I, his unworthy coadjutor, have been for eighteen months and more a fugitive from my ordinary residence, and as yet have no fixed abode." Truly it was apostolic work that they were labouring to perform, and carried out in apostolic conditions. At last in 1750 the aged bishop died in his eighty-second year, and was buried under the chancel floor in Rockfield Parish Church (Protestant) near Perthyre, where his tombstone forms the predella under the communion table. Concerning this, the following incident was described in a letter from Fr Abbott (priest at Monmouth, 1851-1893):¹

The late incumbent was a bigoted parson. In doing some repairs to the church he had this and two other Catholic tomb-

¹ *Cath. Rec. Soc.*, Vol. IX, p. 165.

stones removed, and offered for sale as waste materials. This I heard from some of the Protestant parishioners; so I walked over, and saw the stones reared against the boundary wall. The Vicar happened to call on me, with his wife, on business, a few days after; so I asked him why he had removed the Bishop's tombstone. He said he did not think it right to have a Romish bishop's tombstone there. I said, "Are you not going to replace it?" He replied, "No, certainly not." Then I said, "I will write to my friend the Rev. Dr Oliver, who has published the history of Bishop Prichard with a full description of his Lordship's burial there, and I will get him to put a footnote in the next edition to the effect that, through the bigotry of the Rev. —, this monument was removed in such a year." He then said he would have it replaced immediately. I said, "if you don't, I will hand down your name to posterity like Pontius Pilate's in the Creed." It has been replaced, and his successor, I am told, still repeats the anecdote to visitors.

Bishop York, who succeeded, was a monk of St Gregory's, Douay (now Downside), having taken his vows in 1705 and been ordained priest in 1711. Fourteen years later he became Prior (Superior) of that house, after having been for four years Prior of St Edmund's monastery in Paris (now at Woolhamp-ton). While still Coadjutor to Dr Prichard he got into trouble during the rebellion of '45 by reason of a forged letter which was sent to the Mayor of Bath, and which purported to have been written by a supporter of Prince Charles to the Bishop thanking him for the men and money he had provided, and promising him the see of Carlisle if Charles should become king. The Mayor was soon satisfied that it was a forgery, but none the less advised the Bishop that it would be prudent for him to withdraw from Bath until the affair blew over, and this Dr York did. At the age of sixty-nine he applied for a Coadjutor, and this was the signal for another attempt by the other Vicars Apostolic to take the Western District away from the regulars. This time it was largely because Bishop Prichard had declined to co-operate with the other bishops in securing and promulgating the Decree of 1745 subordinating the regulars to the Vicars Apostolic. On this occasion (1756) the Holy See asked the other bishops to name two seculars and two regulars; but Bishop Stonor (ever the "hammer" of the regulars) suggested they

should decline to name any regulars, and this idea met with the approval of Dr Petre of the London District and his Coadjutor Dr Challoner. Dr Stonor suggested his own nephew, Christopher Stonor, who was Agent of the Bishops in Rome, and amongst the other names put forward was that of James Talbot, later Coadjutor in London to Challoner. Dr York himself suggested Dom Charles Walmesley, a man of brilliant attainments and very high reputation, and the upshot was that in spite of the above action by the other bishops it was Walmesley who was appointed. Seven years later Bishop York asked and obtained permission to retire from his Vicariate to his monastery at Douay as he was old and infirm, and there the remaining six years of his life were spent. His Vicariate thus passed into the hands of Bishop Walmesley.

Dom Charles Walmesley was a monk of St Edmund's, in Paris (the modern Douai Abbey, Woolhampton), and had been professed at the early age of seventeen, while only ten years later he became Superior of the monastery. It is testimony to his great abilities that his various promotions should have come to him so early in life. He was still only thirty-four when he was consecrated Coadjutor to Bishop York in the English College at Rome, but already he was widely known even outside Catholic circles for his sterling worth and especially as a brilliant mathematician. Some of his works on astronomy were published when he was twenty-three, and amongst others an intricate study of the higher mathematics appeared eight years later. But best known was his work on the motion of the moon's apsides, and another on the precession of the equinoxes, in both of which he carried further the investigations of Newton. He was consulted by the British Government over the alteration of the calendar from the Old Style to the New. Dr Oliver, in his *Collections*, styles him "This Athanasius of our English Catholic Church, and glory of the Benedictine Order". His election to a Fellowship of the Royal Society at the age of twenty-eight must be almost unprecedented. Such was the man who ruled the Western District for roughly the last thirty years of the eighteenth century, when the penal laws were expiring and a new spirit was coming in. He was the outstanding opponent of the Catholic Committee and all its Gallican tendencies, and fearlessly up-

held the rights of the bishops. This cost him a large part of his scanty income, as Lord Petre, the leader of the Committee, withdrew in consequence the annuity he had previously allowed him. An event of special interest in his life was his consecration of John Carroll, Bishop of Baltimore, who was the first bishop given to North America. Hitherto the whole of the North American continent had, strangely enough, been subject to the Vicar Apostolic of the London District,¹ and both Bishops Petre and Challoner had had charge of some 25,000 Catholics there. The present very numerous Archbishops and Bishops of the United States and Canada trace their episcopal descent to a great extent to that historic consecration by Bishop Walmesley. In contrast with the numbers thus handed over to an American bishop are the figures for his own Vicariate issued by Dr Walmesley in 1773. These show that the total number of Catholics in the Western District (twenty counties) was only about 3200, Somerset, with 650, having the highest figure for any county; while the whole of Wales had but 750. There were 44 priests, of whom 11 were seculars and 33 regulars (mostly Jesuits). Finally, the sad fact has to be recorded that in 1780, at the height of the Gordon Riots, the mob in Bath (where the Bishop lived) were so inflamed by a party of the rioters from London that they completely gutted the newly built Catholic church, as well as the presbytery; and all the diocesan archives and registers, as also the Bishop's priceless library and manuscripts, perished.

Dr Walmesley's Coadjutor, Gregory Sharrock, had had a career very similar to his own, for he too had become a monk when very young, and had been promoted Superior of his monastery (in his case, St Gregory's, Douay), and then Bishop at very early ages. Thus he was professed when 16, became Superior when 33, and Bishop when 38, being consecrated in Wardour Chapel, "with a solemnity then unprecedented in England since the reign of Mary".² Like many of the bishops of those days he had a very long period as Coadjutor, for it was not till eighteen years after his consecration that he became Vicar Apostolic. When he himself applied for a Coadjutor in 1806 Rome appointed his own younger brother, Dom Jerome Sharrock, an unprecedented event in English ecclesiastical his-

¹ So also were the West Indies.

² Dr Oliver, *op. cit.*

tory. Jerome had succeeded his brother as Prior of St Gregory's, Douay, but he could not be induced to accept his promotion to the episcopate, and in fact died two years later, whereupon the Provincial of the English Franciscan Recollects, Fr Collingridge, was made Coadjutor.

The new bishop had taken the friar's habit at St Bonaventure's, Louvain, and had been head of the Franciscan Academy at Baddesley. During his episcopate he suffered greatly from ill-health and soon asked for another Franciscan, Charles McDonnell, as Coadjutor. But though the latter was duly appointed he resolutely refused to accept the promotion, and it was not till eleven years later that the Benedictine Augustine Baines was made Coadjutor. In a report to Rome on the state of his Vicariate in 1813 Bishop Collingridge mentioned the interesting fact that his income, produced by bequests and donations, was £90 per annum, plus £150 from various occasional and precarious sources, but that his travelling expenses were so great that he had less than many priests; and whereas his Benedictine predecessor had been given a "handsome allowance" by his Order, his own Order (the Franciscan) was the poorest in the Church and could not afford him any allowance. With the death of the Bishop in 1829 there comes on the scene the exotic, flamboyant figure of Bishop Baines, but consideration of his dramatic episcopate must be left till later.

BASIL HEMPHILL, O.S.B.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

EUGCHARISTIC FAST—CELEBRANT

What indults have been obtained in continental countries permitting priests to celebrate Mass without observing the law of fasting from midnight? (W.)

REPLY

i. A certain number of such general indults have been published, and still more are in existence for communicating *more laicorum*. We exclude the latter from this reply, and also the various faculties granted during the war, or since the war as a necessary adjunct to the faculty for celebrating Mass in the afternoon or evening. Attempts have been made at cataloguing and analysing all of these indults,¹ a task which is well-nigh impossible owing to the variety of the documents and the conditions attached, which are not uniform. This lack of uniformity is due, no doubt, to the petitioning Ordinaries who have obtained indults of the nature and in the measure requested; but it seems desirable that there should be some consistency, for example, in the number of hours preceding Holy Communion during which any kind of nourishment, whether food or drink, is forbidden.

For well over twenty years, indults for celebrating Mass non-fasting have been obtainable by individual priests, for the reasons and with the procedure described in communications of the Holy Office, 22 March, 1923, and 1 July, 1931.²

ii. Limiting our reply to general indults obtained by Ordinaries for priests within their jurisdiction who do not come within the categories mentioned in (i), the Archbishop of Cologne has obtained an indult, owing to rationing hardships, permitting priests to celebrate Mass after taking liquid non-alcoholic nourishment (no time limit) and solid food up to three hours previously.³ A Spanish bishop is permitted to allow his priests who are duplicating on days of precept to break the fast.⁴ There must be many similar concessions granted to bishops in various parts of the world.

The fullest and most recent indult we have seen is that obtained by Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris, for the whole of France. It was issued by the Holy Office, 23 (24) October, 1947, for one year, and we are informed that it has been renewed.⁵ The text is as follows:

¹ *Q.L.P.*, 1948, p. 70.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1938, XV, p. 168.

³ *E.T.L.*, 1948, p. 260.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 594.

⁵ *Ami du Clergé*, 1948, p. 17; *Documentation Catholique*, 1947, col. 1601.

SS.mus D. N. D. PIUS, Div. Prov. Papa XII, prae habito voto Em.morum Patrum S. Officii atque auditio Cardinali Praefecto S. Congregationis de disciplina Sacramentorum, et attentis adjunctis prorsus extraordinariis, in quibus Gallia his temporibus versatur, praesertim tenui Sacerdotum et christifidelium valetudine, quae ob immanis recentis belli incommoda labefactata est et magis magisque, in dies ingravescente annona, debilitatur, necnon penuria cleri, imparis ad consulendum curae animarum, desiderium plurium christifidelium S. Communionem frequenter recipiendi explere cupiens, praescripto canonum 808 et 858, §1, pro Gallia derogans, benigne concedere dignatus est Sacerdotibus qui Missam celebrant vel christifidelibus qui S. Communionem recipiunt, in Gallia post horam nonam, veniam sumendi potum non alcoholicum usque ad unam horam ante Missam vel S. Communionem.

Eadem facultas fit Sacerdotibus qui Missam celebrant vel christifidelibus qui S. Communionem recipiunt ante horam nonam, sed vel ad proximioram ecclesiam petendam longum iter peragere debuerint vel ante Missam seu S. Communionem in operoso labore multum temporis consumpserint.

Idque ad annum, quo exeunte Episcopi Ordinarii locorum in Gallia, conlatis consiliis, de usu hujus concessionis accurate et copiose ad S. Officium referent.

MARRIAGE: CASUS PERPLEXUS

A parish priest forgot to apply for a dispensation, third degree consanguinity collateral line, until the parties and guests were at the church. It is a public impediment in every sense, and therefore cannot be dispensed from canon 1045, §3. Short of sending the parties away, what is the remedy? (C.)

REPLY

Canon 83: Parochi nec a lege generali nec a lege peculiari dispensare valent, nisi haec potestas expresse eisdem concessa sit.

Canon 1045, §3: In iisdem rerum adiunctis (cum iam omnia

sunt parata ad nuptias), eadem facultate (super impedimentis in canon 1043) gaudeant omnes de quibus in canon 1044 (parochus, sacerdos ad normam canon 1098.2, confessarius), sed solum pro casibus occultis in quibus nec loci quidem Ordinarius adiri possit. . . .

Canon 1092: *Conditio semel apposita et non revocata . . .*

3. si de futuro licita, valorem matrimonii suspendit.

i. The priest should first try to get in touch with the Ordinary by telephone. The rule which discourages this method has its importance, inasmuch as the Ordinary is held "not to be reachable" if he can be approached only by telegraph or telephone;¹ but an impediment can validly be dispensed in this way, and it is the obvious course to take.

ii. Failing a dispensation from the Ordinary it is certain that the priest cannot himself dispense the impediment. He must decide, firstly, whether it is an impediment which the Church is accustomed to dispense: in the above case it is. Impediments of ecclesiastical law which are not usually dispensed are, for example, the priesthood, affinity in the direct line *consummato matrimonio*, and crime in its second and third degrees: in such cases the priest can do nothing and the parties must be sent away even if the impediment is occult, unless his knowledge is a confessional secret, in which case he cannot refuse to assist at the celebration of an invalid marriage but must try to dissuade the parties from attempting it.

He must decide, secondly, whether in the case of an impediment which the Church is accustomed to dispense there exists a canonical cause. In the above case, even if there are no others, "everything prepared for the wedding" is in our view a canonical cause;² moreover it is a minor diriment impediment and the law is generous in overlooking defects in the final cause.³ The graver diriment impediments are invalidly dispensed unless the final cause is adequate, and the matter is not always easy to determine. The kind of canonical causes required, for example, in dispensing certain very near degrees of consanguinity are defined in an Instruction, *S.C. Sacram.*, 1 August, 1931.⁴ If the

¹ *Code Commission*, 12 November, 1922.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1944, XXIV, p. 515.

³ Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1931, II, p. 550.

⁴ Canons 1042 and 1054.

priest cannot decide that there is an adequate canonical cause he must refuse to assist at the marriage, unless his knowledge of the impediment is a confessional secret, as in the previous paragraph.

iii. We suppose, then, that it is an impediment from which the Church is accustomed to dispense and that there exists a canonical cause. The remedy rightly recommended by many¹ is for the parties to make the contract with a suspensive condition "provided a dispensation is obtained". This must be explained to them and they must clearly understand that they will not be married, notwithstanding the marriage ceremony, until the dispensation is obtained from the Ordinary. The priest should set about obtaining it as speedily as possible and inform the parties immediately.

It is true that normally the contracting parties should not introduce a lawful condition into their consent except after consulting the Ordinary,² but in our view this is a positive law or recommendation which does not bind in the circumstances.

FUNERAL PALL

Should the pall be removed for the absolution at the conclusion of a Requiem Mass? (R.C.)

REPLY

There is no law, so far as we can discover, requiring the use of a pall to cover the coffin during a Requiem Mass, though many directions exist about its colour.³ If it is used it should remain, in our view, during the whole rite, of which the absolution is an integral part. None of the writers we have consulted directs its removal, which in some cases would mean an unseemly commotion and disturbance.

¹ E.g. Heylen, *De Matrimonio*, p. 676.

² *Sacrosanctum*, n. 9, and Appendix I, n. 17.

³ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1936, XI, p. 502.

EXPOSITION: VERNACULAR PRAYERS AND HYMNS

There is much uncertainty about the vernacular prayers and hymns permitted during a period of exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, that is to say not during the rite we call Benediction but during the Forty Hours, the Holy Hour, or any exposition ordered by the local Ordinary. Could the rules be formulated? (R.C.)

REPLY

It is true that there is uncertainty in some particulars, and in places where the local Ordinary has solved these doubts one has only to follow his directions. Subject to this obvious reservation the rules of the common law and of the local law of our *Ritus Servandus* may be formulated, easily as regards recited prayers, less easily in the case of vernacular hymns.

i. Any prayers approved by the Holy See or by local Ordinaries¹ for public use may be recited, unless certain of them are forbidden during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Thus the prayers in *Preces et Pia Opera* or in the English *Manual of Prayers* come within this description, but others may also come within it though not included in either of these books. All are lawful but not always expedient, and a choice should be made suited to the occasion: some useful guidance on the subject may be read in an article entitled "Prayers Before the Blessed Sacrament Exposed" by Abbot Vonier.²

Prayers for the dead are in principle forbidden,³ on analogy, no doubt, with the well-known rule forbidding funeral exequies during exposition, but there are established exceptions. The prayers after the Litany of the Saints, obligatory for the Forty Hours exposition, include one for the departed united in a formula with prayer for the living; moreover a custom of reciting prayers for the dead may be continued "quatenus revera existat".⁴

¹ Canon 1259.

² THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1937, XIII, p. 1.

³ S.R.C., 12 August, 1884, n. 3616.

⁴ 18 February, 1843, n. 2855; cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1945, LXVI, p. 302.

ii. By the common law those vernacular hymns may not be sung which are translations of liturgical hymns.¹

The English bishops permit six English hymns: *Jesus My Lord, My God, My All; Sweet Sacrament Divine; Soul of My Saviour; O Bread of Heaven; Jesus the Only Thought of Thee; O Godhead Hid.*² By implication, therefore, it appears that other English hymns are forbidden, a conclusion which is quite certain for the rite known as Benediction, that is to say whilst the ministers are before the altar from *O Salutaris* to *Tantum Ergo*. But it is not certain that this prohibition extends to other periods of exposition: in our view it does, from the wording of the episcopal communication, and notwithstanding the common law rule which forbids only those vernacular hymns which are translations of liturgical texts. An authentic interpretation of the rule would be welcome, for it is not self-evident why hymns to the Sacred Heart, for example, should be excluded.

INVALID ENGAGEMENT

A young man of twenty desired me to witness his engagement. The lady, aged thirty-five, was not a Catholic, and the man's parents had refused their consent on the grounds that her age, religion, family and reputation made the match undesirable. Did I act lawfully in refusing my signature? (B.)

REPLY

Canon 1017, §1: *Matrimonii promissio sive unilateralis, sive bilateralis seu sponsalitia, irrita est pro utroque foro, nisi facta fuerit per scripturam subsignatam a partibus et vel a parochio aut loci Ordinario, vel a duobus saltem testibus.*

Canon 1034: *Parochus graviter filiosfamilias minores hortetur ne nuptias ineant, insciis aut rationabiliter invitis paren-*

¹ 27 February, 1882, n. 3537. One may hold, with *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, loc. cit., that chanting is forbidden but not the recitation of translated liturgical texts in the vernacular.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1947, XXVII, p. 127.

tibus; quod si abnuerint, eorum matrimonio ne assistat, nisi consulto prius loci Ordinario.

There is reason in the query because the marriage may be valid and lawful, and the faithful have a right to the priest's assistance in making a formal engagement.

i. On the grounds of the man's minority some maintain that a promise of marriage is invalid, unless the parental consent is obtained.¹ This is, however, by no means certain, since the refusal may be unjust, and marriage may be contracted, with the procedure of canon 1017, §1, if there are sufficient reasons to justify it. The law nowhere states that persons under twenty-one are barred from entering upon a valid engagement to marry except with parental consent. On a principle of giving due honour to parents even those over twenty-one should consult them before marriage, but the Church has firmly maintained, even in the remote past when parents arranged the marriages of their children without consulting their wishes, that the election of a state of life is ultimately for the persons concerned, not for their parents, to determine.

The engagement of a minor without parental consent is not for that reason alone invalid. It is unlawful, however, in our opinion, because canon 1034 though referring explicitly only to marriage, seems to include by implication the promise of marriage also. Therefore, on the ground of minority alone the priest rightly refuses his signature, at least until he has consulted the Ordinary.

ii. The impediment of mixed religion, though not diriment of marriage, renders the Catholic party incapable of marrying lawfully unless a dispensation is obtained. It is held by some modern commentators that persons may make a valid and lawful engagement, notwithstanding impediments whether prohibiting or diriment, provided the promise of marriage is conditioned upon obtaining a dispensation, and the impediment is one from which the Church is accustomed to dispense.² Others maintain that an engagement of this kind is invalid, so that when the condition is verified it is necessary for the contract to be renewed. Accordingly, relying on this latter opinion, which

¹ Sipos, *Enchiridion*, p. 504.

² Cf. Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, §85; Heylen, *De Matrimonio*, p. 25.

is fully supported by some Roman decisions, the parish priest is entitled to refuse his signature until a dispensation has been obtained.

iii. Supposing the difficulties mentioned have been surmounted and the priest is not disposed to refuse his signature precisely for the reasons outlined in (i) and (ii), there remains the general undesirability of the marriage on which the parental refusal is based. The point to notice here is that it is wrong because imprudent for persons to contract a marriage which has every likelihood of being unhappy, and it remains wrong even though the parents consent and there are no canonical impediments. One could argue, in fact, that an engagement to contract a marriage of this kind is not only unlawful but invalid, since a contract of promising to do something wrong is invalid from the natural law. Other reasons, of course, may be present which, in all the circumstances, argue that a given marriage though wrong and undesirable is the lesser of two evils. The priest is within his right in using his own judgement about the matter and deciding that, on the whole, the proposed marriage is a folly or a scandal. He then justly refuses his signature, and he can do it the more easily because, if the parties are aggrieved, their remedy is to make their engagement, is so far as it is possible to do so validly, before two lay witnesses.

REMOVAL OF CIBORIUM AFTER CONSECRATION

At a Christmas midnight Mass, when a large congregation desired Holy Communion, the parish priest found insufficient Hosts in the Tabernacle. He directed an assistant to say Mass immediately; the consecrated ciborium was removed after the consecration and before the completion of the priest's Mass. Was this permissible in the circumstances? (P.)

REPLY

S.R.C., 11 May, 1878, n. 3448.7: *Valetne sustineri usus aliquarum Ecclesiarum, in quibus, ratione concursus ingentis*

populi, cum non suffecerit multitudini pro S. Communionem quantitas hostiarum, iam subsequente alia Missa, statim a consecratione reassumitur distributio Communionis. *Resp.* Abusum esse interdicendum.

i. There was sufficient justification for a priest in these circumstances saying Mass in violation of the "aurora" rule of canon 821, §1, or of the midnight Mass rule in §2 of the same canon. The writers, following St Alphonsus, permit anticipation of the rubrical time by two hours for any reasonable cause, and in some rare and extraordinary contingency allow anticipation by more than two hours.¹ Moreover, the faculties of some religious institutes permit the celebration of Mass one hour after midnight, with the presumed permission of a superior; it is a law which the Church is accustomed to dispense, and its non-observance was rightly recommended in the above case.

Another remedy, which the parish priest could have used if the deficiency was discovered in time, was to divide the existing Hosts: there is sufficient authority for dividing each one into four when, otherwise, the faithful will have to be denied Holy Communion.²

ii. The ciborium is validly consecrated at the completion of the words of divine institution, and persons immediately communicating therefrom would validly receive Holy Communion. But doing so involves, firstly, an interruption of the Mass by part of the oblation being consumed before its ritual completion; and, secondly, a violation of the rule requiring the laity to communicate after the priest. The justification for consuming the sacred species immediately after the consecration of the Mass is in *De Defectibus*, x, 2: "si timeatur incursus hostium, vel alluvionis, vel ruina loci ubi celebratur, ante consecrationem dimittatur Missa; post consecrationem vero Sacerdos accelerare poterit sumptionem Sacramenti, omissis omnibus aliis".³ The necessity of preventing irreverence to the Body of Christ is an emergency which justifies departing from all positive laws about the reception of the Holy Eucharist. There is nothing resembling this necessity in the above case. The faithful, having

¹ Iorio, *Theol. Moralis*, III, §246.

² Gasparri, *De Eucharistia*, II, §1098.

³ Cf. Fr Davis in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1939, XVII, p. 456, where this direction is applied to air-raids.

awaited the course of the priest's Mass up to the consecration, must be kept waiting a further few minutes, until the celebrant has himself consumed the oblation.

E. J. M.

LEX ORANDI, LEX CREDENDI

This axiom, concerning the relation between the liturgy and Catholic doctrine, is found quoted in different forms. Which is the original form? What is its exact significance? (B.)

REPLY

Pius XI, Encycl. *Quas primas*, A.A.S., XVII (1925), p. 598: . . . in hac vero laudatione Christi Regis perpetua pulcherrimus nostrorum et orientalium rituum concentus facile deprehenditur, ut etiam in hoc genere valeat illud: *Legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi*.

Pius XII, Encycl. *Mediator Dei*, A.A.S., XXXIX (1947), p. 540: . . . eorum scilicet errorem atque fallaciam, qui sibi sumpserunt sacram Liturgiam quasi quoddam experimentum existere veritatum ex fide retinendarum; quatenus nempe, si certa quaedam id genus doctrina per sacros Liturgiae ritus pietatis ac sanctimoniae fructus dederit, eam ab Ecclesia comprobendam esse, si vero secus, reprobendam. Unde effatum illud: *Lex orandi, lex credendi*.

Ibid.: . . . Hac de causa, quotiescumque de aliqua definienda veritate divinitus data actum est, Summi Pontifices ac Concilia, cum ex "Fontibus Theologicis", quos vocant, haurirent, ex sacra etiam hac disciplina haud raro argumenta duxere. . . . Itaque notum et venerandum illud habetur effatum: *Legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi*.

Ibid., p. 541: Quodsi volumus eas, quae inter fidem sacramque Liturgiam intercedunt, rationes absoluto generalique modo internoscere ac determinare, iure meritoque dici potest: *Lex credendi legem statuit supplicandi*.

"De gratia Dei" *Indiculus*, cap. 8 (date, c. 435):¹ Praeter has

¹ Denzinger, 139.

autem beatissimae et Apostolicae Sedis inviolabiles sanctiones . . . obsecrationum quoque sacerdotalium sacramenta respiciamus, quae ab Apostolis tradita in toto mundo atque in omni Ecclesia catholica uniformiter celebrantur, ut *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*.

i. The original and authentic formula is that which occurs in the last of the passages cited above. Although the words are still commonly attributed to Pope Celestine I it seems quite certain that he did not write them. The document "De gratia Dei" *Indiculus* consists of a number of authoritative statements ("auctoritates") on the subject of grace, of uncertain authorship, which the manuscripts reproduce as an appendix to Pope Celestine's Letter, *Apostolici verba praecepti*, written (431) to the bishops of Gaul about the heresies of Pelagianism and Semi-pelagianism. The doctrine they present is Augustinian in inspiration, and the author, or at any rate the compiler, of them was probably Prosper of Aquitaine,¹ though they have also been attributed to Leo the Great. Whoever their author may be, they appear to have been regarded since the beginning of the sixth century as representing the official teaching of the Holy See.

ii. The meaning of the axiom is to be gathered from the context in which it was first formulated. Briefly, it is that the teaching of the Church is reflected in the universal and traditional prayers of her liturgy. The Pelagians and Semi-pelagians denied the necessity of grace for salutary acts; the latter, in particular, maintained that grace was not necessary for the beginning of faith and conversion, nor for perseverance. Very well, then, wrote St Augustine, if they cannot understand the Scriptures, "let them at least pay attention to their prayers, prayers which the Church has always said from the beginning and will say until the end of time". He then goes on to point out that the Church would not pray to God for perseverance in faith if such perseverance depended solely on man's own will.² "Use your arguments against the prayers of the Church," he says elsewhere to the Pelagians,³ "and when you hear the priest at the altar exhorting God's people to pray for unbelievers that He

¹ Dom M. Cappelain, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1929, pp. 156-70.

² Cf. *De dono perseverantiae*, P.L. xlv, 1031.

³ *Ado. Vitalem*, P.L., xxxiii, 978.

may convert them to the faith, for catechumens that He may inspire them with the desire for Baptism, and for the faithful that by His grace they may persevere in what they have undertaken, laugh aloud at these pious exhortations, and say that you refuse to do anything of the sort. . . ." In chapter 8 of the *Indiculus* the passage we have quoted is followed by a similar mention of the Church's prayers for infidels, idolaters, heretics, schismatics, sinners, and catechumens (still preserved in the liturgy of Good Friday), as proving that none can be converted without the grace of God. The liturgy is thus seen as a "fons theologicus", a source from which we may ascertain what is the accepted teaching of the Church.

Like other axioms, this also has been frequently misinterpreted; and to one particular misuse of it Pope Pius XII calls attention in his Encyclical *Mediator Dei*. It consists in regarding the liturgy as a touchstone of orthodoxy in a utilitarian sense: as though only those doctrines were to be retained which the liturgy has shown to be useful in arousing the devotion of the faithful. His Holiness, repudiating this misinterpretation, insists that "the sacred liturgy does not absolutely or of itself designate or constitute the Catholic faith". Essentially, the liturgy is the Church's public worship of God. But, because the public expression of that worship is a matter subject to the supreme authority of the infallible Church of Christ, her liturgical rites and prayers may, incidentally, provide an indication of what she believes. If the well-known axiom states that "the rule of our faith is established (*statuit*) by the rule of our prayer", the word "establish" must not be understood as though the liturgy provided the foundation upon which our faith is based, but in the sense, common in our law-courts, that liturgical formulas may provide evidence of what the Church believes.

It is because of this equivocation, to which the word "*statuit*" may give rise, that the Holy Father goes on to indicate a sense in which the inverse statement is true: *Lex credendi legem statuat supplicandi*. Faith must be the basis of our worship. And the same is true also, as the Pope observes, of the other two theological virtues.

G. D. S.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

THE BULL "JUBILAEUM MAXIMUM"

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XII INDICTIO UNIVERSALIS IUBILAEI ANNI SANCTI MILLESIMI NONGENTESIMI QUINQUAGESIMI. (*Osservatore Romano*, 27-28 May, 1949.)

PIUS EPISCOPUS
SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

UNIVERSIS CHRISTIFIDELIBUS
PRAESENTES LITTERAS INSPECTURIS
SALUTEM
ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Iubilaeum maximum, quod per proximi anni decursum hac in Alma Urbe celebrabitur, eo potissimum spectat ut christianos omnes non modo ad admissorum expiationem revocet emendationemque vitae, sed etiam ad virtutem sanctitudinemque assequendam, secundum illud: "Sanctificamini et estote sancti, quia ego sum Dominus Deus vester" (*Lev.* 10, 7; cfr. *I Petr.* 1, 16). Ex quo quidem facile cernitur quae quantaque sit antiquissimi huius instituti utilitas. Si enim homines hanc Ecclesiae vocem exaudierint, si a terrenis fluxisque rebus ad aeterna se converterint perpetuoque mansura, tum procul dubio optatissima illa habebitur renovatio animorum, ex qua non tantum privati, sed publici etiam mores christianis praeceptis christianoque afflatu conformabuntur. Siquidem cum recta vivendi ratio singulorum mentes permovet ac sincere efficienterque dirigit, tum necessario consequitur, ut nova quaedam vis atque impulsio universam attingat ac pervadat humanae consortionis compagem, quae ad meliorem feliciorumque rerum ordinem revocetur. Atqui, si umquam alias, hodie potissimum necesse est Evangelii veritate virtuteque reformare omnia. Hominum nusus, quamvis sint laude digni, nec fallacibus moveantur rationibus, tantae huic rei impares tamen sunt; angusta solummodo religio, quae superno auxilio divinaque gratia innititur, tam grandem potest suscipere causam, eandemque, actuose contententibus omnibus, ad salutiferum exitum adducere.

Quamobrem vehementer optamus ut ubique terrarum sacrorum Antistites una cum clero cuiusque suo, commissum sibi gregem ea diligenter edoceant, quae ad proximum Iubilaeum maximum per-

tineant; eosdemque adhortentur ad illud aptiore, quo poterunt, modo participandum, sive Romam venire queant, sive domi permanent; impensiores nempe preces ad Deum fundant; sanctae paenitentiae caritatisque opera multiplicent; ac cetera pro viribus agant, quae Nos, utpote peculiaria proposita per Annum Sacrum assequenda, iam occasione data enuntiavimus.

Itaque, iam nunc uberes salutareshue fructus mente praecipientes, quos supplici a Divino Redemptore poscimus prece, Romanorum Pontificum Decessorum Nostrorum vestigiis insistentes, ac de Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium consilio, universale maximumque Iubilaeum hac in Alma Urbe a Natali Domini N. Iesu Christi, anno millesimo nongentesimo quadragésimo nono inchoandum, et ad Natalem Domini Nostri anno millesimo nongentesimo quinquagesimo finiendum—idque ad normam canonis CMXXIII—auctoritate omnipotentis Dei, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli ac Nostra, ad ipsius Dei gloriam, ad animorum salutem et Catholicae Ecclesiae incrementum, indicimus per has litteras et promulgamus, ac pro indicto promulgatoque haberi volumus.

Hoc igitur piacularis anni decursu, omnibus utriusque sexus christifidelibus, qui rite per Paenitentiae Sacramentum expiati et sacra Synaxi reflecti, vel eodem die, vel diversis diebus, quovis ordine servato. Basilicas S. Ioannis ad Lateranum, Vaticanam S. Petri, S. Pauli ad viam Ostiensem ac Liberianam in Exequiis semel pie inviserint, atque ter preces *Pater Ave Gloria*, semel praeterea *Pater Ave Gloria* ad mentem Nostram, et formulam *Credo* in unaquaque Basilica recitaverint, plenissimam totius paenae, quam pro peccatis luere debent, indulgentiam ac veniam misericorditer in Domino concedimus atque impertimus.

Quae autem supra servanda ediximus ut plenissima Iubilaei venia lucri fiat, pro iis qui aut morbo aliaque legitima causa in Urbe vel in ipso itinere prohibiti aut morte interim praerepti, praefinitum visitationum numerum nondum compleverint neve inchoaverint quidem, ita temperamus, ut iidem, a culpis rite absoluti ac sacra Synaxi reflecti, indulgentiae remissionisque iubilari participes perinde sint, ac si quattuor, quas memoravimus Basilicas reapse inviserint.

Decernimus praeterea iubilarem hanc indulgentiam a christifidelibus, cum sibi, tum vita functis, toties lucri fieri posse, quoties imperata opera rite perficiantur.

Quaenam vero, dilecti filii, sit in universum mens Romanorum Pontificum profecto non ignoratis; at quaenam sit, ad proximum Annum Sacrum quod attinet, peculiaris mens Nostra cupimus apertius clariusque vobis patefacere.

Per admovendas ad Deum supplicationes id imprimis implere-

tur, ut omnes precando paenitendoque sua quisque admissa expient, atque ad christianam morum emendationem ad christianamque virtutem ita contendant, ut hoc Iubilaeum maximum feliciter maturet universalem omnium ad Christum reditum. Idque praeterea est a Deo supplicii petendum prece ut fidelitas, Divino Redemptori ab eo-que conditae societati debita, inconcussa mente actuosaque voluntate ab omnibus retineatur; ut sanctissima Ecclesiae iura adversus hostium insidias, fallacias, insectationesque incolumia semper inviolataque servantur; itemque ut qui adhuc sint catholicae veritatis expertes, qui e recto itinere aberrant, ac vel ipsi infitiores osioresque Dei superna luce collustrentur, ac flexanima gratia permoti ad Evangelii adducantur obtemperandum praeceptis; ut recte composita ac serena tranquillitas ubique terrarum, ac praesertim in sacris Palaestinae locis, quam primum constabiliatur; ut civium ordines, pacatis odiis sedatisque discordiis iustitia fraternaue concordia invicem coniungantur; ut denique indigentium multitudines e suo labore habeant, unde honeste vivant, atque ex largitate caritateque eorum, qui elatiore fortuna fruantur, necessaria opportunaque assequantur adiumenta.

Redeat tandem aliquando optatissima pax in omnium animos, in domesticos convictus, in singulas Nationes, in universamque populorum communitatem; habeant "qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam" (*Matth.* 5, 10) invictam illam fortitudinem, quae Ecclesiam inde ab originibus martyrum cruore decoravit; qui profugi, qui captivi, qui extorres longe a propriis laribus abstrahuntur, ad dulcissimam possint quantocius patriam remeare suam; qui autem dolore maeroreque anguntur, supernis reficiantur solaciis. Christiano pudore fulgeat ac christiana virtute floreat, vigescat animosa iuventus; eique in exemplum prae luceat propecta ac senilis aetas; omnes denique caelesti ea fruantur gratia, quae sit auspiciump sempiternae adipiscendae in caelis beatitatis.

Iam nihil aliud, dilecti filii, reliquum est, nisi ut vos paterna invitemus voluntate ut Romam per piacularis anni decursum frequentissimi conveniatis; Romam dicimus, quae christifidelibus cuiusvis Nationis veluti altera patria est, ubi locum, in quo Apostolorum Princeps post factum martyrium conditus fuit, venerari queunt, ubi sacra martyrum hypogea, ubi templa praeclarissima, ubi avitae fidei avitaeque pietatis monumenta cernere possunt, ac communem Patrem visere, qui, brachia ad eos pandens, amantissimo animo eorum adventum praestolat.

Novimus quidem itinera non omnibus expedita neque facilia fore; iis praesertim, qui tenuiore fortuna utantur atque in longinquis commorentur terris. Atsi, cum de terrenae huius vitae necessitatibus

agitur, tantopere contenditur ut omne genus difficultates evincantur, cur omnino sperare non liceat futurum ut ingentes undique terrarum multitudines, nullis parcentes laboribus, nullisque perterritae incommodis, ad Almam hanc Urbem confluant, caelestia munera impetraturae?

Attamen, dilecti filii, eiusmodi peregrinationes non eorum more suscipiendae sunt, qui delectationis causa iter facere solent, sed pietissimo eo animo, quo iam superioribus aetatibus christifideles cuiusvis ordinis ac cuiusvis gentis, aspera saepenumero commeatumum impedimenta exsuperantes, ac vel pedites, Romam petiere, ut paenitentiae lacrimis suas labe proluerent, ac veniam et pacem a Deo implorarent. Avitam hanc fidem actuosumque divinae caritatis ardorem exsuscitate, augete, in ceterosque infundite; atque ita, Dei Numine adspirante iuvanteque, fiet ut proximum Iubilaeum maximum et singulis, et universae christianorum consortioni fructus afferebat saluberrimos.

Ut autem hae Litterae Nostrae ad omnium notitiam facilius perveniant, volumus earum exemplis, etiamsi prelo editis, manu tamen alicuius notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae ipsis praesentibus haberetur, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Nulli igitur hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae indictionis, promulgationis, concessionis et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die vicesima sexta mensis Maii, anno millesimo nongentesimo quadragesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri undecimo.

Ego PIUS

Catholicae Ecclesiae Episcopus

HOLY YEAR PRAYER

ORATIO PRO ANNO SACRO IUBILARI MCML. (A.A.S., 1949, XLI, p. 187.)

Omnipotens aeternae Deus, de magno Piacularis Anni munere ex animo Tibi gratias agimus.

Caelestis Pater, qui cuncta intueris, qui corda hominum scrutaris et dirigis, eosdem quaesumus, hoc tempore gratiae et salutis, ad vocem Filii Tui dociles reddas.

Da ut Piacularis Annus sit omnibus annus purificationis et sanctificationis, interioris vitae et expiationis, sit devius annus felicitatis ad Te reditus et amplissimae remissionis.

Iis, qui persecutionem pro fide patiuntur, da Tuum spiritum fortitudinis, quo cum Christo eiusque Ecclesia indissolubiliter devinciuntur.

Protege, Domine, Filii Tui in terris Vicarium, Episcopos, sacerdotes, religiosos, sodales et fideles. Fac ut omnes, sacerdotes et laici, adolescentes, adulti et senes, mentibus et animis arctissimo nexu inter se coniuncti, firmam veluti rupem efficiant, in qua inimicorum tuorum impetus illiduntur.

Ope gratiae Tuae in cunctis hominum cordibus flagrans amor accendatur erga tot miseros, qui, egestate et rerum angustiis pressi, vitam degunt humana conditione indignam.

Excita in animis eorum, qui Te Patrem invocant, famem et sitim socialis iustitiae et fraternae caritatis in opere et veritate.

"Da pacem, Domine, in diebus nostris", pacem animis, pacem familiis, pacem patriae, pacem denique nationibus. Caelestis arcus pacis et reconciliationis universum terrarum orbem, vita et doloribus Divini Filii Tui sanctificatum, serenantis lucis suae radii illustret.

Deus totius consolationis, magna quidem est miseria nostra, graves sunt culpaе, innumerae necessitates, sed multo maior in Te fiducia nostra. Infirmitatis nostrae conscii, sortes Tibi nostras filiorum more committimus, intercessionem ac merita Gloriosissimae Virginis Mariae et omnium Sanctorum exiguis precibus nostris adhibentes.

Da aegrotis patientiam et sanitatem, adolescentibus fidei robur, puellis castimoniam, patribus familiarum prosperitatem ac sanctitatem, matribus efficacitatem in munere filios educandi, orphanis benignam tutelam, domo profugis et captivis patriam, omnibus denique Tuam gratiam, exordium ac pignus aeternae in caelis felicitatis. Amen.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR

ADDRESS OF POPE PIUS XII TO MEMBERS OF THE "UNION INTERNATIONALE ASSOCIATIONS PATRONALES CATHOLIQUES" (*Osservatore Romano*, 9-10 May, 1949).

It is with equal solicitude, with equal interest, that We receive in audience both workers and industrialists as they come to Us in

turn and, with a confidence that touches Us deeply, explain to Us their respective difficulties. In welcoming you wholeheartedly, dear sons, We gladly take the opportunity of expressing to you Our fatherly goodwill and of praising the zeal with which you are trying to impregnate the world of economics with Christian social principles.

We have referred to the difficulties of those engaged in industrial production. Unfortunately it is widely assumed that these are due to an irreconcilable conflict of divergent interests—an assumption which is not only untrue but fraught with disastrous consequences. The conflict is only apparent. In the economic sphere employers and workers have both activity and interest in common; and only those who want a blind and irrational tyranny can fail to recognize this reciprocal bond or try to break it. Industrialists and workers are not irreconcilable antagonists; they are collaborators in a common task. They eat at the same table, so to speak, because what they live on is, in ultimate analysis, the net and over-all profit of the national economy.

Each of them, worker and employer alike, draws his pay; and from this point of view their mutual relation does not place the one at the service of the other. To draw his pay is rightfully due to the personal dignity of everyone who, under one form or another, whether as employer or as worker, contributes productively to the yield of the national economy. In the accounts of private industry the wage total may appear as a charge upon the employer. But in the national economy there is only one sort of charge, and it consists in the materials which are utilized for national production and which must, in consequence, be constantly replaced. It follows that it is in the interest of both sides to ensure that the costs of national production are proportional to output.

Given that there is a common interest, why should it not be possible to give it a common expression? Why not allow workers a just part in the constitution and development of the national economy? This is especially necessary today when shortage of capital and difficulties of international exchange paralyse the free play of the costs of national production. Recent attempts at socialization have served only to make this regrettable fact still more evident. It is a reality; and just as it has not been created by illwill on the one side, so it will not be eliminated by goodwill on the other. And so why not now, while there is still time, face the situation with full consciousness of a common responsibility, and so assure the one side against groundless mistrust and the other against illusions which may soon become a social danger?

Our memorable Predecessor Pius XI suggested the concrete and suitable formula for this community of interest and responsibility in the national economy when, in his Encyclical *Quadragesimo anno*, he recommended "professional organization" in the various branches of industry. It seemed to him that there was no better way of overcoming economic liberalism than to establish for the social economy a public juridical constitution which would be based upon the common responsibility of all who take part in production. This point in the Encyclical became the subject of controversy, some seeing in it a concession to modern political trends, others regarding it as a return to the Middle Ages. It would have been incomparably wiser to lay aside contradictory prejudices, and sincerely and energetically set about implementing the project in its manifold applications. At the moment, unfortunately, this part of the Encyclical has almost the appearance of an opportunity lost because not taken in time. Now, however, belated efforts are being made to organize the social economy by means of other juridical forms, and the methods chiefly in favour at the moment are State ownership and the nationalization of industry.

Undoubtedly the Church also admits nationalization, within just limits, and considers that it is legitimate "to reserve to the public authority certain categories of property that represent a power so great that it could not be left in the hands of private individuals without imperilling the common good" (*Quadragesimo anno*; A.A.S., XXIII, p. 214). But to make nationalization the normal rule for the public organization of economy would be to reverse the order of things. The function of the public right is to defend the private right, not to absorb it. Economy is not by its nature an institution of the State, any more than other branches of human activity; on the contrary, it is the living product of the free initiative of individuals and of their freely formed associations.

Nor would it be true to say that each single enterprise is of its nature a society, so that the relations between those who take part in it are determined by the rules of distributive justice, and that all indiscriminately, whether they own the means of production or not, have a right to share the ownership of the enterprise or at least its profits. This conception is based on the assumption that every enterprise belongs by its nature to the province of public right. This assumption is untrue: whether a business be established in the form of a company, or of an association of all the workers as joint owners, or whether it be the private property of an individual who enters into a contract of labour with all his workers, in any case it belongs to the private juridical order that regulates economic life.

What We have said applies to the strictly juridical aspect of business. But a business may also involve a whole set of other personal relations between those engaged in it, including relations of a common responsibility, which must be taken into account. The owner of the means of production, whether private individual, association of workers, or company, must always, within the limits set by public economic law, remain master of his economic decisions. Obviously his income is higher than that of his collaborators. But from this it follows that the material welfare of the members of the public, which is the goal of the social economy, requires him, more than others, to contribute by his savings to the increase of the national capital. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that it is of the greatest advantage to a healthy social economy that this increase of capital should come from as many sources as possible, and it is therefore most desirable that the workers also should be in a position to help by their savings in building up the national capital.

A number of men, industrialists like yourselves, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, have frequently declared in so many words that the social teaching of the Church—and only the social teaching of the Church—can provide the elements necessary for a solution of the social problem. Undoubtedly the realization and application of this teaching cannot be the work of a day. It requires of all those engaged a clear-sighted and far-sighted wisdom, with a strong dose of good sense and goodwill. It requires of them, above all, a radical reaction against the temptation to seek one's own advantage at the expense of others, in whatever capacity those others may be engaged, and at the expense of the common good. Finally it requires a disinterestedness such as only true Christian virtue, maintained by God's help and grace, can inspire.

It is in order to draw down this help and this grace upon your organization, upon its internal development and its extension, especially in countries which, though Catholic, need to yield a more whole-hearted acceptance to the social thought of the Church, that We cordially grant to you all, and to your Association, under the powerful patronage of the Mother of divine love, Our Apostolic Blessing.

BOOK REVIEWS

Twenty Centuries of Catholic Church Music. By E. E. Nemmers. Pp. 212. (Bruce, Milwaukee. \$4.00.)

THERE has been a distinct need for a survey of the entire field of the history and development of the liturgical music of the Church intended for the average intelligent liturgist, rather than for the more serious musical student. Here we have such a book hailing from America. The author is a man of varied interests (he has published the *Breviloquium* of St Bonaventure, and a Dictionary of Economics) and has inherited his interest in Church music from a line of ancestors reaching back to the early eighteenth century, who have all been conspicuous for their work in the music of the Church in America, and to whom the book is dedicated. He tells us in his preface that no particular knowledge of music is necessary for the understanding of the book. In it he has collected an immense amount of historical data showing the development of an art which was the handmaid of an equally developed liturgical act.

To write, in effect, the history of twenty centuries of Church music and to condense the same within the limits of a single volume of two hundred pages would appear an impossible task; yet the author has in a great measure succeeded in accomplishing this. It is not an exhaustive history of the subject, but it is an attempt to bring together the knowledge scattered throughout many authorities, and tells us enough of that history to elucidate the principles and growth of musical worship. Criticism is disarmed by such an effort but obviously the book has its limitations. The literary style of necessity suffers, but one is pleased to find it free from so many phrases that offend the English reader; one sees now and then a certain lack of proportion in the choice of facts and the subject matter of various chapters.

The first chapter, for very little reason, recounts the usual conjectures as to the Greek and Hebrew influence on the Chant. They are pure conjectures and the plain fact of the matter is that the essential character of developed Gregorian Chant, founded on the most natural and primitive melodic formula in ritual music to be found throughout the entire world, lies in its absolute novelty and its utter difference, so far as we are in a position to judge, from everything that has preceded it.

The story of the Chant is told from St Ambrose to its maximum development in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, through its decay from the sixteenth century and on to its restoration in the nineteenth

century by the monks of Solesmes. The author has approached the subject of rhythm with the impartiality and care of an historian. On Plate II there is part of the antiphon "Videntibus illis elevatus est" in the modern transcription of two of the Mensuralist schools and the Solesmes. To the reviewer the facile simplicity of Solesmes is evident, but you may take your choice; one is sure however that not one of these schools would acknowledge the atrocious way the Chant is rendered in the majority of our churches. The footnote on page 30 is misleading, for the names are not in chronological order. Dom Paul Jaussins died prematurely in 1870 and the work of restoring the Chant was given to Dom Pothier, but Jaussins is third on the list next to Dom Jean Desroquettes! Again, the Solesmes School was formed by that group of monks that remained under the leadership of Dom Mocquereau after Dom Pothier's retirement to St Wandrille. Dom Jules Jeannin and Dom Lucien David were in active opposition to Dom Mocquereau; one would infer that they were his supporters. The bibliography at the end of this chapter and indeed of all chapters, is comprehensive and most helpful.

The gradual growth of figured music is shown from the early discoveries of writing two or more parts in melody to the great polyphonic masters of the Netherlands, Roman, Spanish and English Schools. Their inspiration had its origin in the liturgy—the music was evolved out of the situation, not composed for it. It was truly liturgical music.

The dismal story of the disintegration of liturgical ideals in the following centuries is followed by that of its resurrection and consequent reform of Church music in the nineteenth century. A list of the principal societies of the whole Church and their periodicals promoting that restoration is added and is most useful. But what good can there be in the long list of Church music composers of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries? Most are men of very small stature in the history of music; it is far too comprehensive and many of them are to be avoided. They can be culled from a publisher's catalogue from which one can more easily test their practical worth.

The development of the organ and its place in the services of the Church are traced. More stress in such a book as this should have been laid on those liturgical organists who strive to maintain the organic unity of the whole service. Musical interludes and preludes are necessary. What is needed is that these should be in accord with the tonality and the spirit of the liturgical music they have to supplement, so that there shall not be that anti-climax of a fine modal piece ending in irrelevant wanderings that are anything but modal. The treatment of the English School is very meagre indeed. The English

organist was until recently at a disadvantage compared with the French and German players, and from the earliest days of organ music the composers of those countries made church themes the basis of a large proportion of their output. England began to take the instrument seriously later and at a rather poor period in her musical life, but interest having been awakened there has been a substantial and steady growing store of good English Church organ music.

The final chapter on the history of American Catholic music will be of less interest to the English reader, but it is encouraging to read of the numerous societies and periodicals of America striving to maintain the dignity of the Sacred Liturgy. A useful glossary of certain terms peculiar to Church music already defined in the text are gathered together in an Appendix.

This is a book that all who are interested in the development of the liturgy and its music should have. Many books would be better if they were shorter but this could be longer. It will act as a stimulus making us eager for further reading, and the excellent bibliography scattered throughout it will be most helpful.

W. S. BAINBRIDGE

Paul Claudel and "The Tidings brought to Mary". By Kathleen O'Flaherty, M.A., Ph.D. (Cork University Press. 6s.)

RELIGIOUS drama seems to be the Cinderella of the arts. Most of its practitioners in their literary efforts all too frequently lapse into a sentimentalism which is irritating to the intelligent Catholic. M. Claudel, however, in his exquisite plays, is refreshingly different. Not for him the lisping of a tearful maiden or the windy rhetoric of some country yokel who in real life would be tongue-tied. No. As a Catholic dramatist, Paul Claudel seeks to present the eternal truths with dignity and a fine artistry, and to prove to the ordinary theatre-goer that themes of perennial interest, of fundamental importance, are to be found within the framework of Christian theology.

Hence the importance of this new critical study by Dr Kathleen O'Flaherty. Quite rightly, the author does not attempt to interpret all Claudel's work in the small compass of a single volume. What she has done is to select one play, *The Tidings brought to Mary*, and by a careful analysis of its moods and technique she is able, more or less, to give a fair idea of the main characteristics which appear in all Claudel's poetry. Obscurities are elucidated, knotty points unravelled, and we are given convincing proof—if such is really needed—that Claudel's lyricism, vibrant and compelling, is in no way linked with the cold, insensitive poetry of the Parnassian group. One may not always agree with the opinions of the learned Irish critic, but one

has to admit that this scholarly little work throws light on much that is incomprehensible in Claudel's writings. This is a book for the fastidious lover of literature.

The Salvation of the Nations. By Jean Danielou. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

MISSIONARY problems, from the days of early Christianity, have always been acute. In the contemporary world, they have assumed gigantic proportions and are correspondingly disturbing, so much so that the modern missionary needs to be alert to the trends, religious, political, and cultural, which reveal themselves in various parts of the globe. It is a mistake, as M. Danielou points out in these vivid pages, for us to accept as normal that the religion of India or China is not identical with that of France, Italy, and Spain. If Communism is a world problem, then it is time that Catholics everywhere realized that the salvation of the nations is their problem, their responsibility. Furthermore, we have one grave missionary problem on our doorstep: the division of Christianity.

M. Danielou asks whether Catholicism has renounced the task of unifying humanity, and reminds us that we can oppose Communism more effectively by labouring for the real extension of the Faith than by disputing about economic matters, as, e.g. the distribution of wealth or the increase of production, essential though such topics are for the betterment of the people. The author has some interesting things to say about the Orient—it comes rather as a shock to be told that the proportion of Moslems who pray every day is far greater than the proportion of Europeans or Americans—and of the difficulties that confront the prospective convert in the world of Islam. The use of the vernacular, whenever possible, is, in M. Danielou's view, one way of bridging some of the gaps that are ever-present to the mind of a non-European. As Christ wanted to be one of the despised Jews, so today the missionary must be ready to adopt a culture and accept conditions that are alien to his own background.

OSWALD J. MURPHY

A Vade Mecum for Teachers of Religion. By Sister M. Catherine Frederic, O.F.M. Pp. 344. (Bruce, Milwaukee. \$ 4.00.)

TEACHERS in Catholic schools who have no access to a library will find assembled in this book a useful and interesting collection of facts about the liturgical and the devotional life of the Church. The inclusion of short lives of saints, a dictionary of terms, and a list of the principle Catholic sodalities indicates the nature of its contents, and we have found all the points examined accurately described and attractively presented. A bibliography accompanies each section

and a very full index enables one to appreciate the extraordinary variety of topics explained.

The Proper of the Mass. By Dom Laurence Bévenot. Pp. 180. (Cary, London. 5s.)

IN sung Masses the difficulty for parish choirs has always been the plainsong proper. The law is observed, it is true, if these chants are sung on a monotone or on a psalm tone, but the general effect is depressing. Dom Laurence has come to the rescue with an arrangement in four settings of the proper for Sundays and chief feasts, providing formulae which permit a certain variety at choice: each text is sung as a recitative followed by a *jubilus* on the final syllable. It is a principle which already exists in the chant, and notably in the final syllable of the *Alleluia*, and we think that its application, as explained by the writer, will be quite easy for any singers to manage, as well as being effective and pleasing to the ear. Four stout cards accompany the book, enabling one to apply each of the four settings at will to the written text of the proper, and an accompaniment for the organ may also be obtained from the publisher.

Moral Principles. By Alfred O'Rahilly. Pp. 57. (Blackwell, Oxford. 2s.)

NOTWITHSTANDING the title, readers will not find in this excellent series of broadcast talks an English version of what is contained in the moral manuals under the heading *De Principiis*; the chapter on Natural Law, for example, does not discuss its origin and properties. They will find, instead, a running commentary on ethical principles, contrasting the true notion with the outlook of some modern philosophers such as Professor Joad; and their understanding of the principles will be deepened and brought into line with the needs of our contemporaries. The talks are printed exactly as they were delivered, a point which must be born in mind in sentences such as "Prof. Joad doesn't know whether or not he has a spiritual soul and a conscience, but he declares that it is the duty of the Government to treat him as if he had. . . . Society cannot be run on as if's, man's nature cannot be left as a note of interrogation." The force of this would be more apparent when listening to the spoken word. The eight talks, here gathered together at a most reasonable price, will repay careful study.

The Nature & Treatment of Scruples. By Dermot Casey, S.J. Pp. 66. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. Price 2s. 6d.)

The chief point of Fr Casey's two essays on the nature and treatment of scruples is to underline the psychological aspects of this distressing mental abnormality with which every confessor occasionally

has to deal. It fills out the *lacunae* in the manualist explanation of the subject, whilst fully supporting the traditional rules which confessors are recommended to follow. These are ultimately reduced to one rule or remedy, the need for the scrupulous person to subject his own judgement to that of the confessor, a conclusion which appears repeatedly in this work. The book is decidedly not written for the person who has scruples but for the confessor, who, as we all unhappily know, can also be rightly described, though for a different reason, as "suffering from scruples".

The Passion of the Infant Christ. By Caryll Houselander. Pp. 134. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

ADMIRERS of the religious writings of Miss Houselander will find this book well up to the standard of the previous ones. Developing the theme of Christ living in us by grace, she makes Our Lord's birth at Bethlehem the object of meditation, and Calvary is seen to be foreshadowed there. His birth, so to speak, in the souls of men is a replica of Bethlehem, and must start by being an infant life entrusted to us to tend and foster that it may grow to its fulness.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

BILINGUAL LITURGY

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1949, XXXI, pp. 390 ff.)

A correspondent writes:

The new French *Rituale Parvum* contains several points of interest beyond those touched upon in the June number of THE CLERGY REVIEW. In the first place, students of these matters will note, possibly with surprise, that the rendering of *ne nos inducas in tentationem*: "ne nous laissez pas succomber à la tentation", customary in vernacular French prayer books, has now apparently received the approval of the Holy See. They will perhaps be moved to wonder why "Ainsi soit-il", which takes the place of *Amen* everywhere else in the book, is not used in the Burial Service (p. 144); and why *Domine, exaudi orationem meam*, translated "Seigneur, écoutez ma prière" in all the other rites, becomes "Seigneur, exaucez ma prière" in the Baptism of Adults (p. 31). The compilers appear to have thought that

Kyrie, eleison means "Seigneur, ayez pitié de nous", though a reference to the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday (*Agiōs athanatos, eleison imas*) would have shown them that when the liturgy intends to ask for mercy "on us", it does so in so many words. Most curious of all is the hesitating treatment of the prayer-ending *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*. Sometimes this is "Par Jésus-Christ, Notre-Seigneur", sometimes, more correctly, "Par le Christ, Notre-Seigneur", and sometimes, as on pp. 40, 127, it is just left out.

These may appear small points; but no liturgical formula is unimportant, and as the movement for vernacular liturgy gathers force, any bilingual *Rituale* which has been officially approved in one country is bound to influence, for good or ill, parallel compilations elsewhere. The translation of the baptismal question *Fides quid tibi praestat?* in our own *Ordo Administrandi*: "What doth faith bring thee to?" is generally regarded as unsatisfactory on more than one count, but is "Que vous procure la Foi?" really accurate? It is more gratifying to see that the explanation propounded in this REVIEW (June 1947, p. 431) of the difficult passage *ideo inseparabile*, etc., in the Nuptial Blessing, has been endorsed by the French translators. On the other hand, *quod ex uno placuisset institui* surely means "that which it pleased thee to form out of a single substance", not "ceux qu'il vous a plu de créer dans l'unité". And "elle est de celles qui se sont données à Dieu", as a rendering of *haec est generatio quaerentium Dominum*, seems not only inexact but remarkably inappropriate, occurring, as it does, not in reference to a nun taking the veil but in the Blessing of a Woman after Childbirth.

Finally, a word must be said about the printing of this *Rituale*. It is distinguished by what we believe to be an innovation in the treatment of the rubrics. Here the operative word or words are set in bolder type and printed in black to catch the eye. Thus, in the Rite of Extreme Unction, for example, the directions *Ad oculos, Ad aures*, etc., are printed in two colours, the *Ad* in red and the other word in heavy black. The intention doubtless is to help the priest, but it is obvious that the means chosen violates the first principle of liturgical typography, which decrees that rubrics shall be in red and the text in black. When, on top of this, initial letters in the text are printed in red, as here, apparently for mere decoration, rubrication ceases to mean anything and the result degenerates into a parti-coloured chaos.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

